DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 272 UD 011 765

AUTHOR	Deutsch, Cynthia P.; Schumer, Florence
TITLE	A Study of Familial, Background, and Cognitive Style Characteristics of Relatively Successful and Unsuccessful Learners (Determined Longitudinally) in a Harlem Enrichment Program. Final Report for Research Period September 1st, 1969 to August 31st, 1970.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y. Inst. for Developmental Studies.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	31 Aug 70
NOTE	318p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$13.16
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement, *Achievement Gains, *Compensatory Education Programs, Economically Disadvantaged, Elementary School Students, *Family Characteristics, Family Environment, Negro Students, Parent Child Relationship, *Participant Characteristics, Socialization, Socioeconomic Status
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability, Missouri Childrens Picture Series Scale, *New York City

ABSTRACT

During the two years of research reported here, an attempt was made to differentiate those participants--all fourth graders--in an enriched educational program for disadvantaged ghetto children in several Harlem public schools who were thought to profit from a compensatory program, from those who did not. The guiding hypothesis is that the styles and modes of information exchange and communication developed by a family provide behavior norms and perspectives that become internalized by its school-going members. During the first year, a complex family interview technique was developed and used; during the second year it was cross-validated. Also, the second year population was tested with the Missouri Childrens' Picture Series Scale and the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability: additional steps were designed to find out more about the variables associated with "high" or "low" achievement. In brief, more differentiated, smaller, knowledgeable, and stable families, in terms of more conforming and less aggressive children, stable eating arrangements, even mother's wish to work around the house without being interrupted, are associated with higher level cognitive and communicational ratings. [Parts of this document will not be sharply legible due to the quality of the typeface of the original.] (Author/JM)

F-OEO
UD

ED0 54272

FINAL REPORT FOR RESEARCH PERIOD

September 1st, 1969 to August 31st, 1970

OEO Contract No. B89-4590

(B00-5098)

A Study of Familial, Background, and Cognitive Style Characteristics of Relatively Successful and Unsuccessful Learners (Determined Longitudinally) in a Harlem Enrichment Program

Cynthia P. Deutsch, Ph.D.	Principal Investigator
Florence Schumer, Ph.D.	Co-Principal Investigator

Institute for Developmental Studies
School of Education, New York University
Washington Square, New York, N. Y. 10003

Martin Deutsch, Ph.D., Director

UD 011765

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

August 1970

Project Staff (1968-1970)

Current Research Coordinator: Peter Pardine, B.A.

Jo Renée Fine, M.A.
Marguerite Levy, Ph.D.
Dorothy Schmidt, M.A.
William Swinburne, B.A.
Patricia Wagner, M.A

Interviewers: James Billups, M.A.
Andrew Henderson, M.A.

Acknowledgements

We would very much like to thank the children and teachers who have helped us in the execution of our research, and specifically wish to thank the staff and general personnel in the Harlem public schools in which so much of our pilot and experimental activity took place over the two-year research period (1968-1970). The schools in which our final testing took place are: Public Schools 68 (West 127th Street), 79 (East 120th Street), 200 (West 148th Street), and 175 (West 134th Street). Invaluable earlier pilot-testing of all of our techniques and methods took place in the following schools: Public Schools 57 (East 115th Street), 80 (East 120th Street), 83 (East 109th Street), 100 (West 99th Street), and 121 (East 103rd Street).

The following people deserve special thanks for aiding us in our work: Mr. Martin Frey, Mr. Edwin Haas, and Mr. Charles Wilson, District Superintendents; Mr. Kalman Chase, Dr. Abraham Cohen, Mr. Paul Heller, Mr. Harry Horowitz, Mr. Joseph Mitchell, Mr. John Nailor, Mrs. Adele Timpson, Mr. Joseph Sellers, Mr. Leroy Watkins, and Mr. Irving Wernon, Principals; Mrs. Ione Edwards, Mrs. Enid Foreman, Mr. Marvin Galina, Mr. Abraham Goldman, Mrs. Zella Jackson, Mrs. Thomasena Matthews, Mrs. Cornelia Medley, and Mr. Donald Mufson, Assistant Principals; and Mrs. Leslie Abramson, Mrs. Sue Baron, Mr. Michael Berkowitz, Mrs. Dorothy Brown, Mrs. Rosann DeFelice, Mr. Norris Dublin, Mrs. Gertrude DuJour, Mr. John Fager, Miss Marcy Falk, Mrs. Carol Forster, Miss Ruth Gathers, Mr. John Gilmartin, Mr. Donald Golden, Miss Annette Jackson, Mr. James Knight, Mrs. Theresa Lewis, Mrs. Joan Pate, Miss Sharon Reinlib, Miss Mary Romer, Miss Deborah Rudolf, Miss Alice Seelig,

Mr. Steven Seidman, Mrs. Gwendolyn Shepherd, Miss Lorena Spicer, Miss Lillian Visco, Miss Odella Whitsett, and Mrs. Mary Williams, teachers.

We wish to thank the Institute staff who have helped us in our arrangements with the schools, namely, Mrs. Jacqueline Stuchin, Curriculum Director, and Mrs. Fay Fondiller, Miss Edwina Meyers, and Mrs. Laura Schneider Ellis, Supervisors.

We are grateful to many others on the Institute staff who aided us. Mrs. Dorothy Bahadur and Mrs. Sylvia Higgs, Community Aides, were helpful in contacting families who were willing to be interviewed for pilot-testing purposes. Our thanks also go to Miss Edith Calhoun, Director of Social Services, for her advice and aid in contacting the families in our sample. Most invaluable were Mr. James Billups, Assistant Research Scientist at the Institute, and Mr. Andrew Henderson, not of our staff, who helped to conduct the interviews. Special thanks are also due to Mrs. Lynda Hurwitz, Miss Sabena Johnson, Miss Carol Kerr, Miss Zora Klasan, and Mrs. Elsie Santiago for their dedicated secretarial assistance throughout the years.

Finally, Dr. Edith Grotberg and her staff deserve special mention in these acknowledgements in the light of the guidance and advice generously proferred to us during the duration of this study.

Contents

Page

Chapter 1 Background and Hypotheses.......................... 1

Chapter 2 Related Research.................................... 11

Chapter 3 Sample.. 25

Chapter 4 Procedures and Methods, Scoring and Reliability Considerations: The Missouri Children's Picture Series (MCPS) and Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA).............................. 29

Chapter 5 The Family Interview and Ratings (Forms I and II); Scoring, Coding, and Reliability and Agreement Considerations.............................. 40

Chapter 6 Major Characteristics of the Families: Summary of Material Obtained from Each Year's Interviews.... 52

Chapter 7 Findings in Connection with Hypotheses-Testing... 71

Chapter 8 Overview and Conclusions.......................... 114

References 129

Tables 135

Appendix A Final Report for Interim Research Period September 1, 1968, to August 31, 1969

Appendix B Interview Schedules, Form I and Form II; Coding Schemes for Each Interview and Frequencies Obtained for Each Coded Part ("Marginals")

List of Tables

Table

1 Sample II: Mean Age and Sex of Fourth Graders (Fall, 1969) who were in the Institute's Program from Prekindergarten or Kindergarten through the Third Grade

2 Sample II: Initial Stanford-Binet Mental Age Scores (1966) of High and Low Gainers as determined by Stanford-Binet Change Scores (Spring, 1966--Spring, 1969)

3 Sample II: Mean Chronological Age in Months (September, 1969) of High and Low Gainers as determined by Stanford-Binet Change Scores (Spring, 1966--Spring, 1969)

4 Sample II: Initial Stanford-Binet Mental Age Scores (1966) of High and Low Gainers as determined by Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Change Scores (Spring, 1966--Spring, 1969)

5 Sample II: Mean Chronological Age (September, 1969) of High and Low Gainers as determined by Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Change Scores (Spring, 1966--Spring, 1969)

6 Sample II: Initial Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Scores (1966) of High and Low Gainers as determined by Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Change Scores (Spring, 1966--Spring, 1969)

7 Sample II: Initial Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Scores (1966) of High and Low Gainers as determined by Stanford-Binet Change Scores (Spring, 1966--Spring, 1969)

8 Frequency Distributions by Sex of High and Low Scorers for the Missouri Children's Picture Series and Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability

9 Frequency Distributions of Ratings for Two Raters on each Scale of Interview (Form I) and Number of Disagreements between Raters
10 Frequency Distributions of Ratings for Two Raters on each Scale of Interview (Form II) and Number of Disagreements between Raters
11 Inter-Rater Reliability Coefficients (Expressed as k_w) based on Interview (Forms I and II) Rating Scales
12 Relationship of Subscale Ratings to Global Family Rating Scale
13 Relationship Between High-Low Subject Status Criteria and Interview Rating Scales--Form I
14 Relationship Between High-Low Subject Status Criteria and Interview Rating Scales--Form II
15 Significant Findings and "Trends," Form I Interview
16 Additional "Trends," Form I Interview
17 Significant Findings and "Trends," Form II Interview
18 Additional "Trends," Form II Interview

7

Chapter 1

Background and Hypotheses

Brief Background of Study

In our original study (1968-1969), we attempted to identify and characterize the extremes of our pupil population (in the Institute's special enrichment programs in several Harlem elementary public schools)--that is, those who profit from compensatory education and those who do not--in terms of various psychosocial parameters. Toward this end we developed an instrument of family assessment involving a family interview with as many members of the family present as possible, and a set of rating scales to assess the communicational and cognitive style of its members. These methods differ from more conventional methods in their focus on family members' interaction with one another and in their focus on language and communicational processes.

In our original proposal, we outlined some important educational implications of this investigation, stemming from a basic consideration: why are some children, regardless of initial levels of general ability, unable (or less able) to profit from, to use, to absorb from, educational programs designed for them as the "target" population? Why are other (equally disadvantaged) children able (or more able) to gain, despite similarities in cultural background and ethnic status to that of the lower gainers? We thought, perhaps, that we had been looking at possibly important variables in the wrong way or perhaps that we had not been teasing out the significant variables.

It was the overall purpose of this investigation to look at family systems, family interactions, and individual children's behavior from a point of view, a framework, that subsumes cognitive and communicational style variables in ways which differ from the framework of more traditional methods. The overall hypothesis of this research relates to the possibility that family "systems" and "milieus"--viewed in terms of how family members communicate with, and send "messages" to one another (their characteristic communicational style)--may provide various kinds of perspectives and "rules of behavior" that become internalized by the school-going members. Further, we are hypothesizing that these perspectives mediate (enhance or curtail) the children's abilities to listen, attend, conceptualize, sit still, etc.--abilities which are crucial to learning situations, be they formal or informal. (In the design of our research, however, we had not ruled out the possibility that other, more "conventional" sociological and psychological variables may also play an important role in determining achievement-status, and indeed, we included such variables in our interview schedule.)

To achieve our purposes, we developed a family interview for use with families in a group situation, which encourages all members of the family to participate. This interview afforded one or more raters the opportunity (we used two rater-interviewers) to rate the family system for communicational and cognitive level on scales we developed on the basis of extensive pilot-testing. We also developed (and had pilot-tested) behavioral tasks for small groups of children which permitted the relevant communicational and cognitive behaviors to emerge--behaviors which were rated along the same scales noted above. We isolated groups of children in the Institute's demonstration classes in Harlem elementary schools who were regarded as high gainers and low gainers in terms of several criteria (independently of initial IQ levels), and attempted to relate various socio-psychological, background, communicational, and cognitive style variables to the status of the child--high or low--in terms of his ability to profit from the enriched educational program in which he had participated for several years.

Appendix A of the current report, which is the Final Report for Interim Research Period (1968-1969), summarizes the first phase of this research, while the current report completes and brings up to date the methods and findings in connection with the remainder of the research for both years (1968-1969) and (1969-1970). The Appendix thus presents a summary of most of the first year's work. This includes: a description of the first year's sample (the two pupil-extremes identified as high gainers and low gainers on the basis of two criteria); the development and pilot-testing of the family interview; the development and pilot-testing of cognitive style ratings; and the development and pilot-testing of cognitive style sessions in which the index children were carefully observed in small-group sessions allowing their communicational and language behavior to be rated by the observer-raters with no prior knowledge as to whether S̲ was a "high" or a "low." The major portion of the first year's work was thus devoted to developing reliable interviewing techniques for assessing the family members' communicational style as well as for yielding conventional parameters, and in the training of interviewer-raters in the conducting of the interview and in making the required ratings. The development of the behavioral tasks for the cognitive style sessions also required months of research activity during the first year, and the assessment of the reliability of all procedures exployed also involved much time. Appendix A describes these activities in detail as did various Progress Reports during this research period.

Also reported in Appendix A are findings in connection with the relationship of the high-low status of the Ss and their rated behavior in the cognitive style sessions. In general, as this report shows, the reliability of the ratings in the cognitive style sessions was high. But our expectations that there would be a positive correlation between "high" and "low" status as defined by the two longitudinal criteria and cognitive style ratings based on behavior in the cognitive style sessions were not borne out. That is, those Ss who increased most on a given measure (MA or vocabulary score), the high gainers, did not tend to be rated "good" in cognitive and communicational style in the behavioral sessions; and those Ss who increased least on a given measure did not tend to be rated "poor" in cognitive style in the behavioral sessions.

The current (final) report summarizes our research activities and findings from the foregoing point to the end of our funded activities. This includes not only a presentation and summary of all findings in connection with the first year's work not already summarized in Appendix A, but also, a complete and detailed presentation of the second year's work which consists of a replication and cross-validation with a new and equivalent sample of the interview and rating procedures and some additional correlative explorations.

General Objectives and Expectations of Second Year's Work

As already noted, in our attempts to identify and characterize the extremes of our pupil population--that is, those who profit from compensatory education and those who do not--in terms of various psychosocial parameters, we developed an instrument of family assessment involving a family (group) interview schedule and a set of rating scales. These methods differ from more conventional methods in their focus on language and communicational processes, and in their focus on family members' interaction with one another. We continued this research in the second year with a new, but equivalent pupil population in order to replicate and cross-validate the specially developed family interview schedule and cognitive and communicational ratings procedures in an attempt to see if the same variables or sets of variables continued to distinguish the high gainers and the low gainers. The second year's work gave us, in addition, an opportunity to explore several collateral variables thought to be of significance in understanding the differences between those children who have gained and those who have made little progress.

One of our major long range objectives is to plan relevant and focused educational and remedial strategies in the light of our findings. Another long range objective is to offer the professional community some techniques for assessment and prediction that are highly appropriate for disadvantaged, urban children, specifically: an instrument of family assessment, a set of rating scales for language and communicational styles, and a method for measuring self-concepts (actually, we adapted for use an already developed method), for which there will have been accumulated substantial reliability and validity evidence. An additional objective is concerned with the eventual possibility of being able to predict the future academic status of such children as are represented by our sample in terms of various family, communicational, language, and related variables. In the second year's work, thus, we were particularly interested in exploring language variables in our population.

Specific Goals of Second Year's Work

Because of extensive pilot-testing efforts in the first year's work in the development of the home interview schedule, the tasks for the behavioral sessions, and the rating scales, as well as in the training of experimenters with these techniques, we were unable to explore several collateral, related variables that we thought might be of some significance in understanding, and eventually planning educational and remedial strategies with regard to, the characteristics of high and low gainers in our enrichment program. Further, we were dissatisfied with available techniques for measuring the self-concepts and self-perceptions of our subject population--relevant areas of investigation about which we had made no research plans in the first year's work. In addition, since various aspects of language and communication play a key role in our research, we were interested in exploring these behaviors through other (standardized) instruments. And finally, as noted, we were of the strong belief that unless we could replicate and cross-validate our procedures, we could say little about their possible usefulness for predictive purposes in our own, as well as other (similar) populations.

(1) Selection of personality and self-concept measure. In the light of failures of general personality instruments, both of the projective (see Zubin, Eron, & Schumer, 1965) as well as the paper-and-pencil test variety, to predict academic performance, as contrasted to the overall success of measuring instruments that deal more specifically with self-concepts and self-perceptions--see next chapter which reviews some of this material--we have decided to evaluate our sample with a technique that appears both reliable and relevant (for our sample) in assessing various dimensions of the Ss' attitudes toward self. As our review quite specifically suggests, the Missouri Children's Picture Series (MCPS) seemed most appropriate for this purpose.

(2) Language behavior--The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA). Because, as indicated, we had put our major first efforts into developing complex techniques for eliciting, observing, and rating communicational and language styles of our population, we could not introduce other, available techniques which attempt to measure some of the behaviors in which we are interested. Our concern was in discovering whether scores derived from relevant instruments would, on the one hand, relate to the various family variables we have isolated and rated, and, on the other hand, to self-concept variables as determined by the MCPS. We were also concerned, of course, with determining whether ITPA variables would bear any relationship to status (high or low) in terms of the gains made by our subject population at school. We selected the ITPA (described in the next chapter when related research is reviewed) not only because of our successful experiences with this instrument, but also because it was developed from a theoretical model which subsumes some of the same communicational variables as those in which we are interested.

(3) Cross-validation of the family interview schedule and rating scales. We anticipated that many of our interview items as well as ratings would be related significantly to the S's achievement status as defined by relative gains in our enrichment program. If this were so, a necessary methodological step was necessary--replicate our interview procedures with a similar sample to see if, indeed, the same variables or sets of variables and ratings hold up in differentiating the sample. The cross-validation step is rarely taken in much of personality, educational, and sociopsychological research. Sampling errors, errors of measurement, and various other chance and extraneous factors often lower

the predictive strength of an instrument. Therefore, unless this step is taken, the instrument developer cannot report that the techniques he developed will "hold up" with similar samples; he is in even a more precarious position with regard to different samples or dissimilar samples. The point is--and this point is frequently stressed but only infrequently followed by many researchers--that failure to take the next (cross-validational) step often creates the discouraging situation in which the researcher simply cannot make statements about the predictive effectiveness of his instrument or research method. The "second round" of research, then, is the crucial "round" from the behavioral scientist's point of view.

Successful cross-validation of our methods will provide us with an excellent opportunity to offer to the professional community a family interview schedule and a set of rating scales which can be used to observe family members in interaction as well as children in interaction with one another. Such tools and instruments might be extremely useful for purposes of prediction, for planning educational and remedial methods, and for providing standardized methods for evaluation, diagnosis, and research to other workers in the field. Further, through replication and cross-validation of our methods, we will be in a position to confirm or disconfirm not only our overall hypotheses relating to achievement and family communicational systems and milieus, but also to clarify more specific issues concerning the relationship of a variety of family demographic and interactive variables to school status.

Summary of Overall Procedures of Second Year's Work

From the 1968-1969 group of third-graders in the Institute's Harlem public school demonstration classes, after having eliminated relatively recent "fillers" to insure a sample with maximum exposure to the enrichment program, a sample was selected on the basis of gains on the Stanford-Binet and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. Gains were defined as increments from an initial point (three years prior) to a later point in time. These two pupil extremes (high and low), then, were characterized by: (a) familial and background factors as well as ratings of "family systems" as to communicational and cognitive style (obtained by trained interviewers going into the homes working with reliable, observational methods and rating techniques); this aspect of the research enabled us to replicate and cross-validate our specially developed family interview and rating procedures); (b) personality measures as determined by the Missouri Children's Picture Series; and (c) language behavior as defined by scores on the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities. Needless to say, careful consideration was given to reliability explorations at all steps of our investigation. Findings in connection with reliability are reported in a subsequent chapter.

Summary of Overall Rationale for This Investigation

The nation's schools, especially those in the major cities, have had several years of experience with various types of demonstration programs, compensatory projects, and innovative educational procedures designed to make inroads into the overwhelming pattern of educational disability and underachievement that characterizes millions of disadvantaged children from the ghettos. Explorations with different techniques, classroom procedures, and modification of conventional teacher roles and attitudes has been extensive, apparently with varying degrees of success.

Enrichment programs, no matter how high the motivational intent of the teacher or how imaginative and innovative they may be, do not affect all children in the same way. Those who fail to improve, or who do not make the same strides in achievement as do their disadvantaged peers, may ultimately comprise a group of genuine failures in the communities and in the schools. Who are these children? Might they become, eventually, the anomic, the delinquent, the dropout, the marginal youngster growing into the marginal adult, who never finds his place or role in society? We are now ready to take a harder look at some of the failures or relative failures in a special compensatory setting.

The next chapter presents an overview of research related to the general area of our investigation. Chapter 3 describes the sample employed in the second year's (replicative) research. Chapter 4 presents our methods and procedures as well as reliability information with regard to the MCPS and the ITPA, while Chapter 5 does the same, in considerable detail, for the rating scales and both Form I and Form II of the family interview. The remaining chapters present detailed findings and discussion of findings based on intensive data analyses.

Chapter 2

Related Research[1]

Our original proposal surveys (albeit briefly) the vast literature on achievement and some of its correlates. We will not repeat that review, but will instead, after a brief summary of its contents supplemented by mention of more recent reports in the general area of achievement, focus specifically on researches related to some of the techniques and content relevant to the work in the last year of our investigation. This includes researches that involve explorations of the relationship between achievement and various measures of self-concept, and a brief review of the literature describing the specific technique we used in this area--The Missouri Children's Picture Series (MCPS); and recent work with the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities including a description of this instrument and its subtests.

Achievement--General Survey

The review of related research in last year's proposal indicated that academic achievement (as defined by various measures) has been related to different types of personality variables including motivation, self-concept (see next section of the current review), anxiety, conformity, neuroticism, and the like (see Taylor /̲1964/̲ and Tuel & Wursten /̲1965/̲ for reviews of some of this literature). Achievement has also been related to such variables as sociometric status and choices (Teigland, et al., 1966), listening ability (Legge, 1967), and physical mobility of the family (Levine, Wesolowski, & Corbett, 1966). More recent research has continued to explore correlates of academic achievement with regard to similar variables, for example, anxiety (Mulroy, 1968), as well as other individual traits and characteristics such as attentional skills (Lahaderne, 1968), daydreaming behavior (Wagman, 1968), and whether the student pursues individual or group goals in decision-making (Wyer, 1968).

---

[1] This review is taken mainly from the Proposal for Continuation of Research, submitted by the Principal Investigators in April, 1969.

As for background and family variables, we have already noted that various researches have explored the relationship between high or low achievement and parental attitudes and behaviors as well as perception of parent-child relationships (Bayley & Schaefer, 1964; Christopher, 1966; and Shaw, 1964). Because of relevance to our research, special note was also made of studies employing lower-class samples that dealt with family variables and achievement (Crescimbeni, 1964; Levine, Wesolowski, & Corbett, 1966; Mackie, Maxwell, & Rafferty, 1967; and Vosk, 1966). More recently, Sewell and Shah (1968) attempted to demonstrate the close relationship between parents' education and the achievement of their children (with fathers and mothers and boys and girls held separately); and Blau (1968) is currently attempting to identify the different socialization techniques of mothers with high- and low-achieving children.

A related project, extremely relevant to our own study, was reported by Powell (1968). This author attempted to describe certain characteristics of disadvantaged children, divided into groups that were distinguished on the basis of ability to cope successfully with school experiences. An initial pool (predominantly Negro) of 687 first-grade children (drawn from inner city Buffalo schools) was administered the vocabulary section of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (Primary A, Form 1). The thirty-one top-scoring pupils were designated high achievers. A group designated as average achievers was matched to the high-achieving group on the basis of sex, chronological age, verbal intelligence (as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test), and presence in the same classroom. On the basis of several measures of assessment, which included a parent-pupil-teacher questionnaire, the authors sought to confirm or disconfirm various hypotheses. Their negative findings were that reading performance was not related to presence of both parents in the home, occupation of the head of the household, family income, educational background of the parents, or child rearing attitudes of the parents. Positive findings were: reading performance was related to the number of siblings in the home (the majority of families with high achievers contained no more than three children, while the majority of families of average achievers contained four to six children); and reading performance was related to the possession of daily newspapers (in the homes of high achievers).

The foregoing study did not produce many significant findings. We should note, however, that this study, as well as many others described above, did not stress the kinds of familial and communicational variables with which we are concerned. Exceptions can be found in Vosk (1966) and R. Cohen (1968). The latter author worked with sixteen- and seventeen-year-olds in an exploration of the conceptual styles of low SES children and the relationship of these styles to school success. He wished to "explain" the inability of low-income children to meet the demands of school in terms of certain socially induced learning characteristics. The author measured "conceptual styles" more broadly than in the present study; this included various cognitive, language, and social modes of handling different perceptual and abstract materials, and interpersonal situations. Using a variety of measures, and through factor analytic methods, the author was able to identify response-types by which good achievers and poor achievers could be characterized. An impressive number of overlapping considerations in the language and communications measures that Cohen used is found when his specific variables are compared to ours--especially in terms of the rating scales we are using in evaluating the subjects and their families in the behavioral and interview situations.

Studies that have attempted to evaluate the success of various preschool programs are continuing to be reported in the literature. We have already noted that some reports have demonstrated gains on IQ measures and various other ability or achievement measures (e.g., Capobianco, 1967; Douglas & Ross, 1964; Goldstein & Chorost, 1966; and Seidel, Barkley, & Smith, 1967) while others (e.g., Blatt & Garfunkel, 1967) have reported no clearcut conclusions as to the extent or quality of change. Recently, Beller (1968) demonstrated that preschool experiences of disadvantaged children, whether nursery or kindergarten, resulted in higher grades in a variety of school subjects. Pitts (1968), however, found that length of preschool attendance of disadvantaged children was not related to academic readiness but rather to such personality characteristics as independence, cooperation, and dependability, while Larson and Olson (1968) reported that an experimental kindergarten program with disadvantaged children had only a short term effect on subsequent achievement.

Our survey of the literature indicates that although a multiplicity of variables have been successfully related to school achievement, results are by no means consistent, nor have studies specifically concerned with the relationship of familial communicational and conceptual style variables to achievement as identified longitudinally (gains or lack of gains) in enrichment programs been reported. Further, there is by no means consistent agreement that preschool enrichment programs have been successful in maintaining higher levels of achievement than would be the case without such programs. Perhaps the current orientation, which recognizes the possible significance of individual differences in learning styles among the disadvantaged population itself, provides a more realistic model for evaluation research, in that it allows for differential effectiveness of interventive procedures among members of the target population.

Finally, we should mention that there has been increased interest in the relationship of achievement to social class status, and that an increasingly larger number of such researches has been based on preschool or elementary school samples (e.g., Gill, Herdtner, & Lough, 1968; and McGlathery, 1968) in contrast to explorations based on college samples.

Achievement and Self-Concept

There is growing evidence (although this is not always consistently confirmed--see, for example, Fennimore /1966/; and McDaniel /1968/) that achievement or success in school is related to various aspects of self-concept. (See Bhatnagar /1966/ for a review of studies which relate school success to self-concept measures.) We should note that the construct, self-concept, is measured by a variety of techniques and methods with a wide range of psychometric characteristics with regard to such criteria as objectivity and reliability. For example, behavior rating scales, questionnaires, adjective checklists, the semantic differential technique, projective drawings, and sentence completion methods, among others, have been employed in various attempts to relate academic achievement to self-concept; such techniques involve a different set of scoring principles, various kinds of assumptions, and different degrees of reliability. (See Bledsoe, 1964; Bruck & Bodwin, 1962, 1963; Irvin, 1967; O'Hara, 1966; and Stillwell, 1966).

Further, we should add that many studies in this area are based neither on younger children nor on a disadvantaged population. There are exceptions, of course, such as the research of Lourenso, Greenberg, and Davidson (1965).

With older students, some studies were able to demonstrate a relationship between "academic" self-concept (that is, attitudes toward self with regard to school, one's own learning ability, and the like) and achievement (Mulliken, 1966; Payne, 1962), while others could not (Gustav, 1962). In these studies, different techniques were used to measure self-concept; the discrepant findings might be due to differences in the measures used.

More often, the researches reported have related "non-academic" self-concept to achievement. Many of these studies have found positive relationships (e.g., with children, Fink, 1962; Hughes, 1968; and Peppin, 1963; and with high school students, Shaw, Edson, & Bell, 1960; Shaw & Alves, 1963). Using the Q-sort method with high school students Quimby (1967) found that the self-ideal relationship among achievers was significantly higher than that of the underachiever, and that the underachiever had significant differences between his self and ideal self-concepts on many more statements than did the achiever.

Barrett (1957) worked with thirty-two gifted elementary school children (defined by scores on the Nelson Advanced Test) who were divided into achiever and nonachiever groups on the basis of academic achievement. They were given subjective scales to rate, and were also assigned ratings by guidance counselors. The findings indicated that the achievers came closer to the guidance counselors' conceptions of the well-integrated personality, and that they showed greater feelings of worth and ability to persist in the face of difficulty, than did the nonachievers.

Shaw, Edson, and Bell (1960) studied junior and senior high school students. Using the Sarbin Adjective Checklist--in which the subject chooses those adjectives characteristic of himself--they found general confirmation of Barrett's findings concerning differences in self-concepts between achievers and underachiever. They found, however, that male underachievers showed more negative feelings about themselves than did the male achievers, but that female underachievers showed more ambivalence in the feelings regarding themselves than did female achievers.

Using a checklist of trait names (Self-Appraisal Scale) developed in another study (Davidson & Lang, 1960), Davidson and Greenberg (1967) studied the relationship between achievement and self-concept in a group of elementary school disadvantaged children. When component factors of the checklist were analyzed, it was found that high achievers were significantly more positive about themselves with regard to personal and social qualities and in academic competence than low achievers; at the same time, however, low achievers rated themselves as favorably as the high achievers in nonintellectual activities. The authors stated that the feelings of self-competence so essential to achievement functioning were probably related to the areas in which the child had been successful and that it is likely that the school can nurture positive self-image through success in learning experiences.

Payne and Farquhar (1962), employing a different type of self-concept measuring instrument (one which required their teachers to rate brief phrases in describing the Ss as students), also found that it was possible to derive items which significantly discriminated between underachieving and overachieving students.

It should also be noted that various measures of self-concept have been related to reading success. Indeed, Lamy (1965) suggested that the self-perceptions of young children may not only be associated with but actually may be causally related to reading achievement. Self-concept measures have even been successfully used as a predictor of later reading success in young children (Wattenberg & Clifford, 1964).

Various interventive methods have also been employed in attempts to explore the relationship between achievement and self-concept. Short-term counseling of the parents of underachievers had little effect on the underachievers' self-concept or achievement (Southworth, 1966), whereas small group counseling with the students themselves resulted in gains in achievement (Gilliland, 1968). A summer enrichment program, primarily with an academic emphasis, was not found to change self-concept or even to raise academic performance (Brown, 1968).

There is some evidence (but not consistent) that self-concept variables are related to social class. Crosswait (1967) reported that two subgroups of a low socioeconomic sample of Negro fifth- and sixth-graders could be identified on the basis of differing self-concepts and that this distinction was related to whether or not the families from which they came were economically depressed or economically sufficient.

Kerensky (1967), however, reported no significant differences in self-concept measures between a large sample of third- to sixth-graders from low socioeconomic areas and a sample from the general population.

In general, the evidence does suggest some relationship between sociocultural variables and self-concept variables, and achievement and self-concept variables, although these relationships are by no means clearcut.

The Missouri Children's Picture Series: Assessment of Personality and Self-Concept

Because we were interested in studying self-concepts in relationship to the independence dimension in our sample, we had explored various possibilities for self-concept assessment in our particular population. We had decided, after some consideration, to explore the possibility of developing a technique based on Q-sort methodology, and presented a detailed account of relevant literature (concerning objectivity, reliability, and ease of administration) in the Proposal for Continuation of Research, submitted in April, 1969. We introduced that section by describing some methodological considerations concerning the measurement of self-concept, and indicated that Bennett (1964), Cronbach and Meehl (1955), Crowne and Stephens (1961), and Payne and Farquhar (1962) have all considered several problems in operationally defining self-concept.

Bennett (op. cit.), in a review of several studies, reported that existing techniques for measuring self-concepts were vulnerable to a number of criticisms. Among these are the subjectivity of the checklist, the difficulty of consistency in scoring an answer to an open-ended question, and the arbitrary labeling of clusters derived from factor-analytic methods.

In the proposal for continuation research noted above, it was observed that only one study had been reported in which the Q-sort instrument was employed with a young, elementary school (third-grade) sample (Bennett, 1964). As described in the literature (Nunnally, 1959; Stephenson, 1953; Wittenborn, 1961) this technique has been widely and successfully used with older student populations (Quimby, 1967) and adult populations (Medinnus, 1961; Rogers & Dymond, 1954; Walker, 1968).

In the present attempt to explore the possibility of employing Q-sort methodology with disadvantaged third-graders, various problems arose which precluded the development of a reliable instrument. In our pilot-phase experiences, for example, we observed that children at this grade level do not readily understand the instructions required for performance. This appeared specifically to involve the children's difficulty in clearly understanding fundamental relationships required for performance. Additional problems involving reading levels as well as the pure mechanics of administration of this particular instrument required too expensive a pilot investigation in the light of the time limits of the study.

Because of our major concern with item-difficulty as related to reading comprehension levels of the subjects, an instrument, The Missouri Children's Picture Series (Sines, Pauker, & Sines, 1967) seemed relevant to our exploratory aims. Our pilot investigation of various possibilities led us to adopt this instrument which is an objective, nonverbal, enjoyable test situation designed for easy administration and scoring. It consists of 238 simple line drawings, each on a 3" by 5" card. Administered individually, the MCPS requires the subject to place each picture into one of two piles: looks-like-fun or does-not-look-like-fun. The standard administration and scoring procedures presented by the test-developers were followed, permitting the investigators to score for each subscale of the instrument.

The MCPS has been examined quite rigorously for reliability and validity purposes (Sines, Pauker, & Sines, 1968). For example, each subscale has been examined for internal consistency and stability. Furthermore, extensive research has been carried out exploring the validity of the instrument (Baker, 1969; L'Abate & Hosford, 1967; Owen, 1968; and Sines, Pauker, Sines, & Owen, 1969). Criterion measures have ranged from checklist data supplied by parents to institutional and clinically relevant behavior dimensions. The following subscales of the instrument have been scored and employed in current data analyses: Maturity, Conformity, Inhibition, Aggressivity, and Hyperactivity. The scores derived from each subscale are in the form of a standardized T-score, established by sex and age of the subject.

The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA)

For present purposes of assessing psycholinguistic ability, the revised edition of the ITPA (Kirk, McCarthy, & Kirk, 1968) was employed. This edition of the test maintains the model of the experimental edition developed by McCarthy and Kirk (1961). That is, it taps a domain defined by the interrelationship of processes involved in reception, interpretation, and transmission of signals or intentions. Specifically, the communications model proposed by Osgood (1957a; 1957b) is the clinical basis for this instrument. In this respect, the instrument purports to measure three dimensions of cognitive abilities: (a) channels of communication (the routes through which the content of communication flows); (b) psycholinguistic processes (involving the receptive, organizational, and expressive processes which occur in the acquisition and use of language); and (c) levels of organization (including a representational level which requires a complex mediating process of utilizing symbols and an automatic level in which the individual's habits of functioning are less voluntary but highly organized and integrated).

For the revised edition of the ITPA, one basic test has been added to the original battery of nine subtests. The ten basic subtests employed in the present study were the following: (a) Auditory Reception (ability to comprehend the spoken word); (b) Visual Reception (ability to comprehend pictures and written words); (c) Auditory-Vocal Association (ability to relate spoken words in a meaningful way); (d) Visual-Motor Association (ability to relate meaningful visual symbols); (e) Verbal Expression (ability to express one's ideas in spoken words); (f) Manual Expression (ability to express one's ideas in gestures); (g) Auditory Sequential Memory (ability to repeat correctly a sequence of symbols previously heard); (h) Visual-Sequential Memory (ability to reproduce correctly a sequence of symbols previously seen); (i) Grammatic Closure (ability to make use of the redundancies of oral language in acquiring automatic habits for handling syntax and grammatic inflections); and (j) Visual Closure (ability to identify a common object from an incomplete visual presentation).

It should be noted that two supplementary tests--Auditory Closure and Sound Blending--were also included in the Revised edition of the ITPA. These tests were not used in the current study.

The foregoing ten tests were administered individually to the Ss in the current sample by two testers. One male and one female experimenter were employed in testing the children to control for sex differences in performance attributable to the sex of the experimenter. In the actual test administrations, the schedules permitted an even distribution of boys and girls for each experimenter.

The initial form of the ITPA was standardized on an all-white sample of 2½ to 9 year-old children from Decatur, Illinois. The revised edition, also standardized on a similar population, included children from six school districts in Illinois. For this edition, norms have been extended through age 10. In both the experimental and revised editions of the ITPA, black Ss were not included in the standardization sample. The standardization samples were selected on the basis of average performance on the traditional measures of intelligence, school achievement, and socioeconomic status, and on intact motor and sensory development.

The ITPA (both editions) has been employed successfully with disadvantaged (primarily black) children in studies at the Institute for Developmental Studies (Deutsch & Silfen, 1969; Schwartz, Deutsch, & Weissman, 1967). Most recently, the revised edition has been employed (Deutsch & Victor, 1971) for purposes of characterizing experimental children exposed to the Institute's demonstration program. Earlier researches using the ITPA have been reviewed by Bateman (1965), in a report which contains an annotated bibliography of additional investigations and a complete list of ITPA references up to the time of that review.

The major source of information concerning reliability and validity on the ITPA is that for the experimental edition. Little reliability and validity information is available for the revised version of the ITPA. Overall estimates of reliability (both internal consistency reliability and stability reliability) for the experimental edition were reported as being "quite adequate," whereas reliability estimates by age group were reported to be lower (McCarthy & Kirk, 1963). Other evidence reported in the literature (McCarthy & Kirk, 1961) indicates that concurrent, construct, and predictive validities are adequate. However, in the light of additional reports (e.g., Weener, Barritt, & Semmel, 1967), which have indicated that the restricted sample used in standardization procedures reduces the generalizability of the normative data, further evidence concerning the ITPA is warranted.

Chapter 3

Sample

Detailed presentation and discussion of sample selection procedures and characteristics of these Ss for the first year's work, involving the behavioral sessions and the family interview (Form I), are presented in Appendix A which is the Final Report for the Interim Research Period (1968-1969). Tables 1-6, on pages 39-44 of this Appendix, present this material in direct, tabular form.

The sample described in this chapter, Sample II, comprises one drawn from a similar population to last year's sample (Sample I), and is being used for a cross-validation and replication of our specially developed family interview and ratings of cognitive and communicational style as well as for exploring additional variables possibly associated with relative success or lack of success (determined longitudinally) in the Institute's enrichment program.

The larger population from which the Ss in Sample II were drawn in the Fall of 1969, consisted of children in fourth-grade classes at Public Schools 68, 79, 200, and 175, in Harlem. This sample was drawn from a group consisting of only those Ss who entered the Institute's demonstration program at the prekindergarten level (1964) or the kindergarten level (1965) and remained with the program through the third grade. There were 31 such Ss. The distribution of this sample by school, age, and sex is shown in Table 1.

Of these children, 30 had been given the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale in both the Spring of 1966 and the Spring of 1969, and 31, the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) both in the Spring of 1966 and the Spring of 1969.

The first step in classifying the Ss into "high" and "low" groups consisted of computing the discrepancy for each S between the Stanford-Binet mental age score he obtained in 1966 (kindergarten) and the Stanford-Binet mental age score he obtained in 1969 (third grade). The discrepancy between each S's mental age score on the PPVT obtained in 1966 (Kindergarten) and 1969 (third grade) was similarly calculated. Two frequency distributions of these discrepancy scores were made.

When the top and bottom 40% of the Stanford-Binet discrepancy distributions, and top and bottom 40% of the PPVT discrepancy distributions were inspected, it became apparent that there was little overlap between them. That is, only six children could be regarded as high gainers by the criteria of being in the top portion of both distributions; and only five children could be regarded as low gainers by the criterion of being in the bottom portion of both distributions. Under these circumstances, Ss were classified as high gainers or low gainers on the basis of discrepancy scores for each of these tests separately.

On this basis, four subsamples were selected as follows:

(1) High gainers and low gainers on the Stanford-Binet mental age discrepancy criterion. High gainers are defined as those 15 Ss whose discrepency score is at least 3 years, 4 months (the top 40% of the sample). Low gainers are those 12 children whose discrepancy score is 2 years, 9 months of less (the bottom 40% of the sample). The range of discrepancy scores is 3 years, 4 months, to 4 years, 6 months for the former, and 2 years, 9 months, to 10 months for the latter group.

(2) Very high and very low gainers on the Stanford-Binet mental-age discrepancy criterion. Very high gainers are defined as those 9 children whose discrepancy score is at least 3 years, 5 months (the top

30% of the sample). Very low gainers are those 9 children whose discrepancy score is 2 years, 6 months or less (the bottom 30% of the sample). The range of discrepancy scores is 3 years, 5 months to 4 years, 6 months for the former group, and 2 years, 6 months to 10 months for the latter group.

(3) High gainers and low gainers on the PPVT. High gainers are defined as those 14 children whose discrepancy score is at least 3 years, 3 months (the top 40% of the sample). Low gainers are those 11 children whose discrepancy score is 2 years, 11 months or less (the bottom 40% of the sample). The range of discrepancy scores is 3 years, 3 months to 5 years, 7 months for the former group, and 2 years, 11 months to 1 year, 2 months for the latter group.

(4) Very high and very low gainers on the PPVT. Very high gainers are defined as those 10 children whose discrepancy score is at least 4 years, 0 months (the top 30% of the sample). Very low gainers are those 9 children whose discrepancy score is 2 years, 7 months or less (the bottom 30% of the sample). The range of discrepancy scores is 4 years, 0 months to 5 years, 7 months for the former group, and 2 years, 7 months to 1 year, 2 months for the latter group.

Tables 2-7 present various characteristics of the high gainers and low gainers, selected on the basis of the foregoing criteria. Table 2 compares initial mean Stanford-Binet mental age scores (1966) of high and low gainers, and very high and low gainers. It can be seen from this table that the high and low groups thus designated do not significantly differ from each other in initial mean mental age scores. Table 3, which presents mean chronological age (as of September, 1969) for the high and low groups also shows that high gainers do not significantly differ from low gainers in chronological age.

Table 4 presents the initial mean Stanford-Binet mental age scores (1966), and Table 5 the mean chronological ages (September, 1969), of the high and low gainers as determined by the PPVT change scores (Spring 1966--Spring 1969). These tables show that both in terms of initial mental ages as well as chronological ages, high gainers do not differ significantly from low gainers as determined by the PPVT scores.

In addition, as Tables 6 and 7 respectively indicate, high and low gainers as determined by PPVT change scores (Table 6) or Stanford-Binet scores (Table 7) cannot be statistically differentiated on a significant level by their initial PPVT mental age scores.

The above findings are of considerable significance to the purposes of our study, for they indicate that initial levels of general ability or of chronological age do not determine whether or not an S is designated as high or low in terms of criteria we have used. They reconfirm our expectation that we must look elsewhere for variables that determine a child's changes in the years of exposure to educational programs. The current study represents a further attempt to isolate at least some of the relevant variables.

Table 1 has indicated that the basic sample comprises an N of 31. The families of 30 of these Ss were interviewed because one family would not consent to an interview. All 31 Ss, however, were administered the MCPS and the ITPA.

Chapter 4

Procedures and Methods, Scoring and Reliability Considerations: The Missouri Children's Picture Series (MCPS) and Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA)

In accordance with the plan of the study, the 31 Ss in our sample were administered the MCPS and the ITPA during the months of April and May, 1970. These tests were administered in two separate sessions, with the ITPA always administered first to any specific S.. Sessions comprised the administration of only one or the other of these instruments, it should be noted, with the MCPS sessions lasting approximately 20 minutes and the ITPA sessions about one hour. No problems arose in connection with the actual administration of these instruments, although a minor scheduling problem existed when the absence of an S required the tester to return for an additional session in the schools. All tests were administered individually to the Ss in vacant classrooms to provide conditions free from distraction. Permission from parents was obtained for all testing sessions.

In order to control for any possible effects attributables to sex of examiner on a child's performance, an equal number of male and female subjects was randomly assigned to one male and one female examiner. A child assigned to an examiner was tested by that examiner for both test administrations.

The remainder of this chapter describes in some detail the administration procedures and instructions, scoring methods and some reliability considerations for these two instruments.

The Missouri Children's Picture Series (MCPS)

At the end of Chapter 2, we discussed some of the rationale behind using this instrument to assess certain personality variables. Pilot results were based on explorations with third-grade children in Public School 121 during the winter of 1970. Pilot testing disclosed that the MCPS is an objective, enjoyable, brief instrument which is easily administered on an individual basis to a sample of elementary school children.

The materials for the MCPS consist of a set of 238 standard MCPS cards and scoring sheets. The set of 238 cards is shuffled after each use. The cards do not have to be in numerical order. The set of cards is placed by the E in front of the child, picture sides up. The colored card on the bottom of the set is removed and placed to the right (the S's right) of the deck of cards. S is then asked to pick up the card which is on top of the deck and he is told:

> ALL THESE CARDS HAVE PICTURES ON THEM. I WANT YOU TO LOOK AT EACH PICTURE AND SEE IF IT LOOKS LIKE FUN TO YOU. IF A PICTURE LOOKS LIKE FUN TO YOU, PUT IT ON THE (YELLOW/BLUE) CARD, HERE ON THE RIGHT. IF IT DOES NOT LOOK LIKE FUN TO YOU, PUT IT ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE CARDS. NOW LOOK AT THIS FIRST PICTURE. DOES IT LOOK LIKE FUN TO YOU?

If S says that it does look like fun, he is told:

> OKAY, PUT IT HERE, ON THE RIGHT, ON THE (YELLOW/BLUE) CARD. THAT IS WHERE YOU WILL PUT ONES THAT LOOK LIKE FUN TO YOU. THE ONES THAT DO NOT LOOK LIKE FUN TO YOU, YOU WILL PUT HERE, ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE PILE OF CARDS, ON THE LEFT (E points).

If S says that the first picture does not look like fun, E says:

> OKAY, PUT IT HERE, ON THE LEFT, ON THIS SIDE OF THE PILE OF CARDS (E points). THAT IS WHERE YOU WILL PUT THE ONES THAT DO NOT LOOK LIKE FUN. THE ONES THAT DO LOOK LIKE FUN TO YOU, YOU WILL PUT HERE, ON THE (YELLOW/BLUE) CARD, ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE PILE OF CARDS, ON THE RIGHT.

S is now told:

> PICK UP THE NEXT CARD AND LOOK AT IT. DOES IT LOOK LIKE FUN TO YOU OR DOESN'T IT LOOK LIKE FUN TO YOU?

If S says that it looks like fun, he is told:

> OKAY, PUT IT ON THE RIGHT THERE ON THE (YELLOW/BLUE) CARD. (After this has been done): WHERE WOULD YOU HAVE PUT IT IF IT HAD NOT LOOKED LIKE FUN?

If S says that the second picture does not look like fun, he is told:

> OKAY, PUT IT ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE PILE OF CARDS ON THE LEFT. (After the card has been placed correctly): WHERE WOULD YOU HAVE PUT IT IF IT DID LOOK LIKE FUN?

If the E feels that the S is confused about the instructions or the task at hand, he should then continue the instructions with a third card from the deck. Generally, if at anytime during the sorting the examiner feels that the S is confused or faltering, he should repeat these instructions.

The E continues in this way until he is sure that S understands what is wanted of him, and he observes S at least long enough to be sure that he is able to attend to the job. In the event that the S is very distractible, E may have to repeat the question for each card in the set.

Sometimes the S will ask questions when he is unsure of himself, or when he is suspicious of the testing situation, or when compulsivity or concreteness interferes with easy decision-making. These questions should be responded to either with the original instructions or else with amplifications which keep to the spirit of the instructions and do not influence the S to respond one way or the other. Following are some examples of questions and possible replies:

"What if I can't decide whether it looks like fun or not?"

> JUST LOOK AT IT AND DECIDE ONE WAY OR THE OTHER. SEE IF IT LOOKS JUST A LITTLE BIT MORE LIKE FUN OR IF IT LOOKS JUST A LITTLE BIT MORE LIKE IT IS NOT FUN. THEN PUT IT ON THE PILE AND FORGET ABOUT IT.

"Sometimes it's fun and sometimes it isn't. What should I do?"

> JUST LOOK AT IT AND DECIDE IF IT IS MORE LIKE FUN THAN NOT LIKE FUN, OR THE OTHER WAY AROUND. DECIDE ONE WAY OR THE OTHER AS BEST YOU CAN AND THEN FORGET ABOUT IT.

"This used to be fun when I was smaller. Do you want me to say if it's fun now or if it used to be fun?"

> I WANT YOU TO SHOW IF IT LOOKS LIKE FUN TO YOU OR IF IT DOES NOT LOOK LIKE FUN TO YOU. DECIDE ONE WAY OR THE OTHER AND THEN GO ON TO THE NEXT ONE.

(From a girl): "This is fun for boys but not for girls. Should I show if it's just fun, or if it's fun for girls?"

> I WANT YOU TO DECIDE WHETHER IT LOOKS LIKE FUN TO YOU OR WHETHER IT DOES NOT LOOK LIKE FUN TO YOU.

When the above is completed, E immediately records the sort on the scoring sheet in accordance with instructions described below.

Scores and reliability. Each picture has a number in the lower right-hand corner of the card. They are numbered from 1 to 238. The responses are recorded on a scoring sheet which contains 238 numbered spaces. Only the does-not-look-like-fun responses are recorded. Transparent templates, provided for each subscale, are used for deriving raw scores on each subscale. The templates contain X and 0 markings defining key items for each scale. An X on a template means that on that scale the item is scored if it was placed in the not-fun pile (and therefore has an X marked in the appropriate space on the recording sheet). An O on a template means that on that scale the item is scored if it was placed by the child in the fun pile (so that the corresponding space on the recording sheet is blank). Each X or O response has a weight of 1, and the raw score for a particular scale is the number of spaces on the recording sheet which match those on the scoring template.

The raw scores were converted into T-scores with the use of conversion tables provided by the test developers. These tables were derived from the MCPS results on the 3877 school children in the normative sample. There are separate tables for boys and for girls at yearly intervals from ages 5 through 16. The following subscales of the instrument have been scored and are employed in current data analyses: Maturity, Conformity, Inhibition, Aggressivity, and Hyperactivity.

Research with MCPS has been extensive and reliability as well as validity data have been reported. It should be noted (Sines, Pauker, & Sines, 1968) that the items which have been employed in all of the subscales of the MCPS show significant and positive discrimination among known test samples. Furthermore, these subscales have been investigated in terms of internal consistency of items, ten-day retest reliability, and six-month retest reliability. These data are reported for each age-group and sex separately.

Because sex of subject enters into the scoring procedures, for current data analysis purposes, subscale scores were held separately for each sex. That is, an S's status on any particular subscale depends only on the distribution of such subscale scores for that sex group in our current sample. A median cut-off was established for each subscale distribution for each sex, and S's status--high or low--was established.

Cases were eliminated where the S's rank fell at the median of the distribution of scores. The total possible N for this instrument was 31, 21 males and 10 females. For each subscale (See Table 8), the following frequencies resulted:

Conformity--high, 15; low, 16
Maturity--high, 15; low, 14
Aggressivity--high, 16; low, 11
Inhibition--high, 17; low, 14
Hyperactivity--high, 16; low, 15

Table 8 also indicates the sex breakdown for the foregoing.

The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA)

As noted above, the ITPA was administered to all children in a session lasting approximately one hour. Testing was completed during the months of April and May by two testers, one male and one female, experienced in administering each of the subscales of the revised edition of the test battery. The ratio of male (female) Ss to female and male testers was approximately equal.

The specific procedures for subtest administration and instructions closely adhered to those suggested by the test developers (Kirk, McCarthy, & Kirk, 1968) for the revised edition. A complete description of the instructions for administration is reported in detail in the Examiner's Manual provided for the ITPA. Materials consist of an Examiner's Manual which includes instructions as well as those test items which are presented orally by the examiner. Those materials which require visual presentation are included in the test kit. These consist of pictorial item booklets presenting visual analogies, visual similarities, as well as pictures portraying the context of the examiner's verbal expressions to S. Objects presented to S are also included in the test kit. Familiar objects, i.e., a ball, block, envelope, and button, as well as plastic chips with geometric designs, are provided. Standard scoring forms and tables for score conversion are also included in the test kit.

A brief description of the general requirements for each of the subtests follows:

(1) Auditory Reception: requires the S to respond (e.g., yes, no) to questions presented orally by the examiner. The test contains 50 short, direct questions printed in the Manual. Typical items are: "DO DOGS EAT?" "DO DIALS YAWN?" "DO CARPENTERS KNEEL?" "DO WINGLESS BIRDS SOAR?"

(2) Visual Reception: In this test there are 40 picture items, each consisting of a stimulus picture on one page and four response pictures on a second page. The child is shown the stimulus picture for three seconds with the directions, "SEE THIS?" Then the page of response pictures is presented with the directions, "FIND ONE HERE."

(3) Visual Sequential Memory: S is shown a sequence of geometric figures, represented pictorially, for five seconds, and then is asked to reproduce the sequence with plastic chips, each with a geometric design. Here the child is allowed two trials on each sequence of figures when the first attempt is unsuccessful. The sequences of geometric figure increase in length from two to eight figures.

(4) Auditory-Vocal Association: A sentence completion technique is used, presenting one statement followed by an incomplete analogous statement, and allowing the child to complete the

second statement appropriately. There are 42 orally presented analogies, such as, "I CUT WITH A SAW; I POUND WITH A ______." "A DOG HAS HAIR; A FISH HAS ______."

(5) Auditory Sequential Memory: This test assesses the child's ability to reproduce from memory sequences of digits increasing in length from two to eight digits. Digits are presented at the rate of two per second. The child is allowed a second trial of each sequence if he fails on the first presentation.

(6) Visual-Motor Association: The child is presented with a single stimulus picture surrounded by four optional pictures, one of which is associated with the stimulus picture. The child is asked "WHAT GOES WITH THIS?" (pointing to stimulus picture). "WHICH ONE OF THESE? (pointing to the four optional pictures). The child is to choose the one picture which is most closely related to the stimulus picture, such as a sock belonging with a shoe, or a hammer with a nail. The test consists of 42 items.

(7) Visual Closure: There are four scenes, presented separately, each containing 14 or 15 examples of a specified object. The objects are seen in varying degrees of concealment. The child is asked to see how quickly he can point to all examples of a particular object within the time limit of 30 seconds for each scene.

(8) Verbal Expression: The child is shown four familiar objects one at a time (a ball, a block, an envelope, and a button) and is asked, "TELL ME ALL ABOUT THIS."

(9) Grammatic Closure: There are 33 orally presented items accompanied by pictures which portray the content of the verbal

expressions. Each verbal item consists of a complete statement followed by an incomplete statement to be finished by the child. The examiner points to the appropriate picture as he reads the given statements in the Manual, for example: "HERE IS A DOG; HERE ARE TWO ______." "THIS DOG LIKES TO BARK; HERE HE IS ______."

(10) Manual Expression: In this test 15 pictures of common objects are shown to the child one at a time and he is asked to, "SHOW ME WHAT WE DO WITH A ______." The child is required to pantomine the appropriate action, such as dialing a telephone, or playing a guitar.

The 10 subtests were given in the following order for all Ss tested: Auditory Reception; Visual Reception; Visual Sequential Memory; Auditory Association; Auditory Sequential Memory; Visual Association; Visual Closure, Verbal Expression; Grammatic Closure; and Manual Expression. As the authors explained, this order of test administration was designed to permit maximum performance from the child. For example, to establish initial rapport with the child, verbal response is minimized on the first test. The Auditory Reception Test is administered first and is followed by a simple picture without a feeling of failure. Because the Visual Sequential Memory Test required the longest time to give, it is placed early in the battery to minimize the effects of fatigue to which it is more susceptible than other tests. Finally, the authors note that it is desirable to separate the two tests of association to avoid the effect of mental set. Similarly, the two sequential memory tests were separated, as were the tests of manual and verbal expression.

Scores and reliability. Again, the instructions given by the test developers were adhered to very closely for scoring purposes. With the exception of the Visual Closure and Verbal Expression subscales, ITPA scoring requires consideration of both the basal and ceiling levels determined during administration. Very simply, the basal level is the lowest item in a specified sequence of successful items and below which no item attempted has been failed. This level is established on the basis of the sequence indicated in the Manual for each subtest at the beginning of administration. Below this level, credit is assumed for the items not attempted, i.e., not in the specified sequence. This credit is added to the number of correctly answered items prior to the child's ceiling level--the highest item of a sequence in which a specified number of items has been failed.

For the Visual Closure and Verbal Expression tests, all items are administered and scored for all subjects, i.e., there is no basal or ceiling level. The scores are simply the sum of points obtained on the respective tests.

Each tester scored his own protocols when they were completed; cross-checking of these protocols was done by the second tester. Raw scores for each subtest protocol were transformed to scaled scores from tables provided by the authors. These scores, based on age norms, are provided for each subscale in the battery. The scaled scores were then summed to provide a composite score for the battery.

Optimal cut-off points were established at the upper and lower 40th percentiles of the distributions based on the composite scores of the ITPA, resulting in a sample of 25 Ss, 13 Highs and 12 Lows. Table 8 indicates a further breakdown, by sex, of these composite scores. Of the 18 males, 11 were high and 7 were low on the distribution of composite scores. Of the 7 females, 2 were high and 5 were low on ITPA total score. It should be noted that there is no relationship between sex and composite score on the basis of these data. These data resulted in a non-significant chi square (Yates-corrected) value of 1.033.

Information concerning the reliability and validity of the scores derived from the ITPA battery has been presented in Chapter 2.

Chapter 5

The Family Interview and Ratings (Forms I and II); Scoring, Coding, and Reliability and Agreement Considerations

The Progress Reports, describing work-in-progress during the first (1968-1969) phase of our study, describe in considerable detail the development of our special family interview, including rationale, item inclusion, and pilot-testing. For convenience, the reader is referred to Appendix A of the current final report (Appendix A is the Final Report for the first year's work), specifically pages 15-24, which describes and summarizes in considerable detail these aspects of our interview development. This material is briefly summarized in the next section. Note that Appendix B presents the final forms of both interviews, together with the "marginals" for each item. The number of families interviewed with Form I was 36 and Form II, 30. Findings in connection with these interviews are presented in subsequent chapters.

Summary: Development of Form I

Appendix A, pp. 15-24, covers the following material:

(1) Description of our rationale for devising an interview situation which would yield several levels of behavior, including demographic and interactive data, as well as data based on opportunities for family communication to arise. This rationale resulted in an interview situation which would require as many members of the family to be present as possible, with interview items and family-oriented "tasks" devised so that family interactional and communications systems would emerge.

(2) Summary of all steps in item construction, including sources for the original pool of items in the literature and in existing

interview schedules, rationale for the selection or elimination of certain items, and description of the content areas covered by the interview.

(3) Summary of procedures involving interviewers. This section included a description of role-allocation and functions during the interview, the relation of race of interviewers to role assignment, and the training of interviewers.

(4) Description of procedures in connection with the pilot-testing of the interview. This includes the role of community aides in selecting and arranging for the families to be interviewed at this stage and the actual experiences of the interviewers in pilot-testing.

(5) Modifications and changes introduced in the final form of the interview as a result of pilot-testing experiences.

(6) The "formal" interviews. This section includes the duration of the interviewing period, the development of coding procedures including content analysis of qualitative data, problems in the interpretation of item responses, provision for handling discrepancies between coders, and necessary modifications in coding following actual data collection.

The Family Interview--Form II

Form II represents both a replication and refinement of the interview procedure developed in the first year's work with a similar population of families selected from the same overall population and in the same manner as in the previous year's study. In essence, its focus and major content remained the same. That is, as many members of the family as possible were interviewed at the same time, many interview items were designed to be directed to the family as a group, and family-oriented questions dealing with specific situations were introduced to provide opportunities for the rating of cognitive and communicational style. In addition, the primary areas covered in the first year's work--demographic, interactive, and cognitive and communicational--were maintained. As previously noted, Appendix B of the current report presents the final form of the second interview, together with "marginals"--obtained frequencies for each coded part.

All revisions of Form I for replication purposes were introduced following an extensive assessment of both the distribution of responses to all items and effectiveness or inappropriateness of certain items for our population. In actuality, as can be seen directly from Appendix B, the revisions were neither very numerous or very radical. More than two-thirds of the original items are worded in exactly the same manner in both forms. Only one item was completely omitted, and about a dozen other item changes involved either the deletion or rewording of only one part of an item.

Changes were of three types: (a) deletions of either a whole or part of an item; (b) modifications, i.e., rewording of part of an item, adding a probe, etc.; and (c) addition of new items. In actual format and application of the interview, for clarity and continuity, revisions were noted in Form II in the following manner. If all parts of an item were deleted, then the item number was totally removed from the interview schedule. Thus, all items following the deleted item would still retain their original item number (assuring numbering consistency when the two samples were combined). A modification or deletion of only a part of an item was indicated by an asterisk placed to the left of the item number. A totally new item was assigned an item number based upon its location at a midpoint between previous items. For example, one new item was designated 33.5 because it was placed between item 33 and item 34.

The one item deleted from Form I was Item 10, in which the children were asked: "What are some of the things you do with your friends after school?" This item was omitted primarily because it did not elicit a range of responses from the year I sample (most Ss said they played with their friends after school). Furthermore, coding difficulties arose since many children described several recreational activities, thus creating a necessity for an extremely generalized code.

Modifications and partial deletions were made to maximize the probability of our obtaining a range of codable responses. This goal necessitated the rewording of ambiguous questions, the omission of irrelevant questions, and the addition of probes encouraging further elaboration on the part of the respondent. Some examples of modifications and deletions are:

(1) Item 6--participation in groups and clubs. In Form I, interviewers assessed the degree of the respondent's participation on the basis of a description by the respondent of how much time was spent in that group's activities. In Form II, the interviewers facilitated this task by also asking the respondent to assess directly his participation, i.e., to state whether he is very active, moderately active, or inactive in his group membership.

(2) Item 25--presence or absence of the father in the home. Probes for part of this item were extended so that interviewers could determine the exact amount of time an absent father had been away from the home. (In Form I, this information was obtained only in a general way.)

(3) Item 38--does mother read? Part of this item in Form I was, "Are there any books or magazines in the house right now?" All families in the 1968-1969 sample noted the presence of reading material in the home (and in most homes, the presence of books and magazines was directly observed). Thus, this part of Item 25 was eliminated.

(4) Item 39--mother's pride in children's activities. Part of this item was reworded so that the children's responses would indicate the parent's usual response when proud rather than her response to an isolated incident.

Five new items were added to Form II. Each of these was developed by the research staff in an attempt to further explore areas that might differentiate the "high" and "low" families in our sample. These items are listed below:

(1) Item 33.5 (ASK PARENTS)--Do you think there are some things that mothers (parents) should not discuss with their children?

(IF YES)--What sort of things should not be discussed?

(2) Item 34.5 (ASK PARENTS)--Could you tell me some of the things that (name index child) has been doing in his/her class in the past month? (Probe for specifics, e.g., Could you tell me more about that?)

(3) Item 36.5 (ASK CHILDREN)--Does anyone in the family ever help you with your homework?

(IF YES)--Who? About how often?

(4) Item 37.5 (ASK PARENTS)--What do you think is the most important thing your children should learn in school?

(5) Item 38.5 (ASK PARENTS)--Would you say that your children are very much alike or very different from one another?

(IF ALIKE)--In what ways are your children alike?

(IF DIFFERENT)--In what ways are your children different?

In addition to modification of item content, slight changes were also made in item coding procedures for Form II. These changes primarily involved adding categories to an existing code (since the content of responses sometimes differed from Form I to Form II). We also deleted irrelevant codes (e.g., we found that coding the kinds of books read by siblings 12 years of age and over did not provide data useful to our study). The entire process of coding Form II responses was facilitated by the work completed on the first year's interview schedule.

Coding procedures for the Form II interview were identical to those performed for Form I. Two members of the research staff, working independently, transferred the data from each interview to code sheets. Fortunately, as noted, this task was facilitated for the Form II interview replication by the precoding of many items not precoded in Form I. This precoding was, of course, made possible by the extensive analysis and coding of qualitative material from the first interview. After each interview was independently coded, the two staff members compared code sheets to ascertain consistency. Discrepencies in coding for Form II were handled as in the previous year. Errors in coding were corrected; and disagreements in coding were discussed with a third member of the research staff in which case either agreement was reached or the response was considered a "can't rate."

Interviews utilizing Form II were conducted from May through August, 1970. The interviewing team for this sample was composed of two staff members, one white (female) and one black (male) who had taken part in the 1969 study. The additional black male interviewer used in the earlier study was not available for the interview replication. As in 1969, the white staff member was permanently assigned the role of recorder while the black staff member interviewed the families. These roles, however, were flexible and thus the recorder could freely participate in clarifying responses, correcting omissions, etc. Since the same two interviewers were involved in both studies, the further training to be gained from the pilot-testing of a few families was considered unnecessary. The team did, however, role-play, using the revised interview form, in order to fully familiarize itself with its contents.

All sample families were initially contacted through a mail request for a home interview. Those families from whom there was no response were later contacted by other methods, e.g., obtaining the correct address through school records, making direct visits to the home, etc. The majority of interview appointments were set up by telephone following a mail response. All interviews were arranged at the convenience of the family. As in 1969, each family received $10.00 for participating in the interview.

Most home visits were made in the afternoon and early evening. All family members were encouraged to be present for the interview. This usually worked out well in the case of mother and siblings. However, some fathers were unable to be present because of late afternoon or evening work schedules. It was found that the time required to complete the revised interview form was approximately the same as for the original interview (60 to 90 minutes depending upon family size, family's verbal fluency, interviewers' waiting time, etc.).

As noted, 30 of the 31 sample families were interviewed. The remaining family head stated a flat refusal to be interviewed and discouraged all Institute contact. All thirty families were extremely cooperative in making and keeping appointments.

The Rating Scales

Various progress reports, especially Progress Report #2 in connection with the first year's work, describe the development of the ratings scales that were designed to be applicable to the behavior observed during the interview. Pages 25-30 of Appendix A of the current report contains illustrations of the behaviors relevant to the scales which have been labeled (for identification purposes only) as follows:

(1) Overall communicational level (separately rated for the entire family, mother or parents, siblings, and index child).

(2) Mode of communication.

(3) Formal aspects of communication (1): listening and attentional skills.

(4) Formal aspects of communication (2): responses to or awareness of the listener and others in the group.

(5) Formal aspects of communication (3): task furtherance and completion.

(6) Formal aspects of communication (4): transitions and sequencing.

(7) Conceptual level of communication: abstractness, elaboration, and clarity.

(8) Content aspects of communications or messages.

(9) Introspectiveness ("looking at one's own behavior").

(10) Generality of responses to others.

(11) Mother or parental figure's role in maintaining the "rules" of effective communication.

The specific behaviors relevant to these scales can be understood only in the context of the illustrations provided for their characterization and identification. Our pilot experiences led us to believe that these behaviors are identifiable and observable. Indeed, the behavioral and family situations (as we had constructed them) permitted the relevant communicational responses to occur.

Behaviors which emerged in an interactive context that were considered "ratable" were based in part on formal responses to questions and tasks presented to the family during the interview, noise level of the family communication network, motility factors, personal interaction among family members not necessarily related to interview items, and the nature of the specific responses elicited--verbal or paraverbal. In addition, the manner in which the emitted response reflected cognitive skills such as conceptual level and introspectiveness and the degree to which the response was appropriate to the question presented were also considered.

At the completion of each interview, the two observer-interviewers present at the interview rated the family members along the various behavioral dimensions. The interviewers had worked extensively in achieving a common frame of reference for making these ratings during pilot phases of this study, both in pre-study interviews and role-playing sessions. Questions which arose regarding discrepant ratings and any differences between the observer's orientation were discussed and resolved during pilot phases. One specific difficulty handled during pilot phases was that relating to rating an entire family at once--the global family rating. Interviewers found that the components of the family unit (e.g., siblings and mother) differed in their styles of communication. This difficulty was resolved by constructing four separate ratings for: family as a whole; mother or parents; siblings; and index child.

Thus, although a global family rating was still obtained for the interview session, differentiation among family members was also possible.

As can be ascertained from the foregoing, the original ratings consisted of ten scales covering various aspects of language and interactional and communicational behavior as well as an overall communicational scale to be applied to the mother or parents, siblings, index child, and family as a whole. Each of the foregoing scales (as we eventually used them after each formal interview) required a forced-choice rating on a six-point scale with three scale points above a hypothetical midpoint and three scale points below the midpoint. (Note, in pilot-testing, we employed four-point scales which we later abandoned because they were rather difficult to handle.) A lower numerical rating reflected a higher level of cognitive and communicational style, i.e., a higher attentional level or a higher conceptual level.

Tables 9 and 10 present for each of the foregoing ratings, for Form I and Form II, the frequencies of ratings by each rater, dichotomized into high (below the midpoint) conceptual levels and low (above the midpoint) conceptual levels. Number of disagreements across midpoints are also indicated on these tables. Note, when reliability considerations are discussed below, it will be seen that "crude" agreements do not form the basis of exploration. Instead, the actual specific scale point agreements and disagreements enter into the statistical procedure used.

In the first year's data, the distribution of three scales contained an excessive number of "can't rate" ratings for at least one of the two independent raters. Because of the small ns which emerged for behavior ratable by both observers, these scales were deleted from further consideration, including use in Form II interviews. These scales were:

(4) Formal aspects of communication (2): responses to or awareness of the listener and others in the group; (8) Content aspects of communications or messages; and (10) Generality of responses to others.

For the remaining scales, inter-rater agreements were determined on the basis of Cohen's (1968) recommended use of Weighted Kappa (k_w) as a coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. This statistic not only corrects for chance agreement, but also permits differential weighting of disagreements according to the degree of gravity of such disagreements. Table 8, on p. 46 of Appendix A (Interim Final Report), contains the matrix of the weights employed for this procedure on all scales. (Note that the same matrix was employed for all scales used in the second year's study as well. This matrix was also used, as this table indicates, for exploring reliability of observations in the cognitive style sessions.)

Table 11 presents the results for analyses of inter-rater agreement for both years; two-tailed p values are reported for each of the values (z) of the normal curve deviate. In all comparisons (Year I), these values were positive and highly significant.

Further, a simple check on the contribution of each of the remaining scales to the overall global family rating was investigated by means of the phi coefficient. This was done for one rater who was involved with the interview in all its phases. Table 12 presents these data. It can be observed that each of the remaining scales relates positively and significantly to the overall global family rating, perhaps providing some indication of the internal consistency of the rating scales employed. These data warrented the inclusion of all eleven scales in the second year's study.

There were no format changes for the rating scales in the second year's study. The eleven scales were used on a sample of 30 families by two independent observers. Again, results for each of the rating scales based on this sample were carefully studied with regard to each scale's distribution as well as reliability considerations.

For the second year's administration of the rating scales, two items resulted in distributions with an excessive number of "can't rate" ratings. These were: (6) Formal aspects of communication (4): transitions and sequencing; and (11) Mother or parental figures' role in maintaining the "rules" of effective communication. These scales were eliminated from further data explorations. Weighted Kappa procedures were then employed for the remaining nine rating scales. Table 11 presents these reliability findings. As can be seen in this table, all but one scale--Introspectiveness ("looking at one's own behavior")--yielded positive findings. This scale was also eliminated from further data explorations, resulting, finally, in the use of eight of the rating scales in the analysis of the second year's work. It should be noted (see Table 12) that the remaining scales all relate highly to the global Family rating.

Chapter 6

Major Characteristics of the Families: Summary of Material Obtained from Each Year's Interviews

The preceding chapter described our interview procedures, rating scales, and methods for scoring and ascertaining agreement and reliability between coders, raters, and researchers handling the material. Now we would like to present more substantive material about the families themselves, in order not only to set the stage for the chapters to follow, but also to communicate to the reader the nature of the population with which we are working. We will be presenting actual findings obtained from our interviews for both years, characterizing these familial units by the more usual demographic variables, as well as additional salient features which empirically emerged. We will also be concerned with judging the similarity (in a general way) between the two samples drawn each year. Chapter 7 will present findings in connection with hypothesis-testing and other data-analyses procedures, it should be noted. The reader is reminded that Appendix B contains a complete outline of the interview schedule (both Forms) as well as the "marginals" (frequencies obtained for each of the coded parts for each interview item). The current chapter makes no attempt to present all these raw frequencies and marginals--only the more relevant ones.

Before we begin to formally characterize our samples, we should like to present the reader with some additional qualitative aspects of the families.

The families interviewed each year comprise almost entirely black families living in Harlem--with a few exceptions, see section below--with children in Public Schools. Although some families presented a little resistance to being interviewed, by and large, they were cooperative with the interviewers, welcoming them into their homes. Note, however, these were Institute families accustomed to at least some interview procedures and/or contact with at least some Institute personnel. One family (second year) flatly refused to be interviewed, and are not included in the sample, nor are they included in findings based on data analyses. It goes without saying that we do not know the characteristics of this family in terms of the relevant variables of our study.

Generally speaking, the interviewers felt comfortable in the homes; they were occasionally offered refreshments and were usually shown to the most comfortable seating arrangements in the apartment. On occasion, but only infrequently, the household atmosphere was not formally "set" for the interview situation. For example, a TV set was left on, and in one family, lights were not put on in the room in which the interview was conducted. The interviewers tried to "remedy" the situation as best as they could. In the latter example, however, upon request, it developed that the one light bulb in the living room had been burned out and the household head was reluctant to replace it with another from another room. Another mother had apparently forgotten about the interview appointment althogether, and another time had to be scheduled.

As will be seen later, there were occasional visitors, primarily neighbors or relatives not expected in the "formal" interview situation. They were permitted to stay for the duration of the interview (or less) depending on their wishes. On one occasion, an entire family (from the South) arrived for a visit just at the interview time. There was too much excitement and general social disorganization in the home for the interview to be completed, and another one had to be arranged.

Housing conditions varied over a wide range, with public housing dwellings being consistently superior, in the eyes of the interviewers. "Good" home conditions were also found, however, in non-public housing dwellings. In the latter, however, it was more likely that the interviewers came upon conditions such as unsafe stairways, animal excrements in the halls and public floors, unsavory odors, roaches, etc. The interviews in both years were conducted in the Spring and summer months, when it was more likely for children, pets, adults, etc. to be in the halls, on the stairs, outside on the stoops, and in the streets. Noise levels in the streets and the apartments were generally high, but one interviewer noted that her own lengthy residence in New York City had accustomed her to a rather high noise level so that she did not feel these acoustical conditions were limited to Harlem.

Within each of the apartments, "attractiveness," cleanliness, neatness, and the like varied over a considerable range, as did the formality and structure of the family unit, mother's control over the children, and the family's affective interaction. In some families, the mothers tended to dominate the situation; in other familes, the mothers encouraged the children in very positive ways to respond to the interviewers. As noted, control and discipline over the children varied over a considerable range. In one family, for example, a three-year-old was rather disruptive, but the mother made no serious attempt to handle the child's continuous interruptions of the proceedings. In other families, virtually the opposite was true.

The father's presence in the interview situation was a relatively infrequent occurrence. In the handful of families in which fathers were present, however, they tended to participate fully in the interview and were not dominated by the mother.

A noted in the preceding chapter, ratings were based not only on specific responses to specific questions, but also to family task situations and other qualitative aspects of behavior. Space does not permit an account of the various qualitative, "anecdotal" and narrative comments that the interviewers provided with regard to the "life style" of the different family units. Suffice it to say that the observer-interviewers responded to and described a wide variety of interactions, incidents, and qualities including, for example: striking differences between the cognitive levels of the mothers and their children in some of the families, or between spouses in other families; or wide variations in cohesiveness, warmth, and feelings of togetherness or closeness that some families showed; or dramatic differences in the children's behavior from family to family in terms of their reticence, talkativeness, patterns of motility, and the like. Some families seemed to have a steady flow of visitors--relatives, friends, girlfriends, boyfriends, neighborhood children, etc., while other families seemed virtually isolated in terms of the mainstream of action around them. Some mothers were excessively strict, unyielding, and "proper" in their behavior toward their children; other mothers were informally permissive, spontaneous, and easygoing.

But above all, each family maintained its distinctiveness, personal style, and almost palpable qualities of difference which estabiished it as a system and an entity--different from other such entities despite the presumably equalizing variables of proximity, welfare status, housing conditions, or color of the skin.

Describing the families as they emerged on the basis of the interviews, thus, might suggest that they are uniform in nature, in their structure and roles and function. This is hardly the case, as one might suspect. Perhaps there are, nevertheless, distinctive, isolable features of the families that yield the "lows" (in terms of the index children) or the "highs." The next chapter explores this consideration while the remainder of the current chapter describes the interview situation and the families as they empirically emerged in the course of our study, regardless of the hypotheses of our exploration.

Note, there were 36 families interviewed in the first year's study and 30 in the second. For both years, the majority of families were black, with 34 and 29 black families respectively, in each year. The remaining families were of Puerto Rican origin. All but three of the sixty-six families interviewed in the two years of the study lived in Harlem. The exceptions occurred during the first year of the study, and involved three families who had moved to the Bronx after the index child had completed the third grade. Two of these families were interviewed in their homes in the Bronx; the third family was interviewed in the home of the maternal grandmother in Harlem.

The Interview Situation

(1) There was an average of 5 persons present during the first years's interviews (range--3-8) and an average of 4 persons present during the second year's interviews (range--2-9).

(2) Three of the families had both the mother and father present during the first year's exploration while in the remaining families the mother only was present. In the second year's series, three families also had both parents present at the interviews, and with one exception,

the remaining interviews had the mother present. The one exception was in a family in which the mother could not or would not attend. One of the fathers present in the Year II interview situation, it should be noted, was not living in the household at the time of the interview.

(3) There were, on an average, 4 siblings (including the index child) present at the interview during the first year's series, with a range of 2 to 6 siblings. During the second year's series, there was an average of 3 siblings present at the interviews with a range of 3 to 7.

(4) In terms of non-nuclear family members present at the interviews, the following breakdowns emerged: during the first year, in 6 of the families there were children other than siblings present at the interview, i.e., friends and/or relatives. In 3 of the families interviewed, there were adults other than parental figures present throughout the interview, and in 3 families there were persons wandering in and out of the room during the interview. In 7 or the 30 family interview situations in the second year, there were children other than siblings present at the interview. Adults other than parental figures were present in 2 of the interview situations, and in only 1 instance, during the second year, persons were wandering in and out of the room in which the interview was conducted.

Family Composition

(1) The average size of the families interviewed in the first year was 6 permanent residents. Family size for this sample ranged from 3 to 11 members. In addition to these permanent members, there were two families with persons temporarily residing in the household.

The average size of families interviewed in the second year sample again was 6 permanent residents. The range in family size for this sample was 2 to 9 members. In none of the families interviewed was the presence of a temporary resident reported.

(2) Of the 36 families interviewed the first year, only 22%, or 8 of them, reported that both mother and father lived in the household. Of these families, family composition for two families included a grandmother as well. The 8 instances with 2 parents included one family with a father who was not the father of the index child in the sample. The remaining 28 families (78%) in the first year's sample represented families with a mother or mother figure only present in the household.

Of the 30 families interviewed the second year, 40% or 12 of them reported that both parents lived in the household--apparently a more intact family sample from the point of view of parental presence. The remaining 60% of the sample, 18 instances, reported that a mother or mother figure only was present in the household.

Index Child and Siblings

Preceding tables (for example, Table 1) present data with regard to the index children. This section attempts to describe the samples in terms of interests, activities, and cognitive ratings of the index children and their siblings as emerging in each year's sample.

(1) In most (25 or 69%) of the families interviewed the first year, there were 2 or fewer siblings older than the index child; in 7 of the families (20%), there were 3 or 4 children older, and in 4 families (11%), 4 or 5 older than the index child. In 2 families, the index child was the only child living in the household. In the second year's sample, most of the families (19 or 63%) also contained two or fewer siblings

older than the index child. Of these families, 11 or 37% had 3 or more children older than the index child, with 10 instances in which there were 3 to 4 children, and one instance of 5 children older than the index child. In only one instance during the second year the index child was the only child living at home.

(2) Regarding the children's occupational interests, in the first year's sample, all but one index child gave an indication of occupational aspiration. This child had not yet thought about his occupational choice. For those children (32) where responses could be coded, 84% (27 children) stated professional aspirations. Of these, 4 children indicated professional-athletic goals. The remaining 23 children indicated professional choices such as teaching, medicine, and law. In the rest of the total sample for this item (4 cases), choices ranged from semi-professional to unskilled occupations (two children chose semi-professional, and two unskilled occupations).

Occupational aspirations were also obtained for siblings ten years or older (excluding the index child) for the first year's sample. In 9 cases for Year I families there were no children ten years or older, and in 4 additional cases, responses could not be obtained, i.e., these children were not present at the interview. Of the remaining 23 families, in 11 of them (48%), all children above age 10 verbalized professional aspirations; while all the children in only 3 of the families verbalized clerical-secretarial choices; in 39% of the families, there were mixed responses, i.e., some professional and some semi-professional, verbalized by the children over 10 years.

In the second year of the study, it was possible to code occupational aspirations for index children in 26 families. In 77% (20) of these families, index children responded with professional choices (this included 4 cases with choices as professional athlete). Again, in only one case did the index child state that he had not thought about occupational choice. In the remaining instances, there were 2 semi-professional choices, 2 clerical-secretarial choices, and 1 skilled occupational choice.

There were two families with no children ten years or older in the second year's sample. Of the remaining 28 families, occupational choice for 11 families could not be ascertained. In 59% (10) of the rest of the 17 families, all the children above age 10 verbalized professional aspirations; in one family all the children indicated clerical-secretarial occupations, while in the remaining 35% of the sample of 17 families, choices were mixed among various occupational levels.

(3) Of the families interviewed in the first year, in 22% of them (8), none of the children (including index child or siblings older than the index child) belonged to any club or group. In 3 of the families, most of the children (e.g., three out of four) did not belong to any club or group, while all of the children in 31% (11) of the families were coded as very active in at least one club or group. In 39% (14) of the families, some of the children were moderately active or very active in at least one club or group.

In the second year's sample, in 37% (11) of the families interviewed none of the children belonged to any group or club, while in 43% (13) of the families, all of the children were very active in at least one club or group. In 1 case, all the children were moderately active in at least one group or club. In the remaining 17% (5 cases) of the sample, one or more of the children in the family were moderately or very active while one or more of the children were not members of any group or club.

(4) Continuing with the interests of the index children in the sample, it is interesting to note that in 83% (30) of the families interviewed in Year I the index child said that he read books besides school books. In two cases (6% of the sample), the index child said that he did not read any books other than school books. In 4 cases (11% of the sample), this item could not be rated. Of the total sample for the first year, 42% (15 cases) of the index children indicated that they read books other than comic books, 25% indicated that they read other books as well as comic books, while 11% indicated that they read comic books only (note that 22% of the total sample could not be rated for this item).

In the second year, 93% (28) of the index children indicated that they read books besides school books, while 7% (two cases) indicated that they did not. In this sample 40% (12) of the index children said that they read books other than comic books, while 34% (10) of these children read comic books as well as other books; 4 children (13%) read comic books only (4 Ss could not be rated on this item).

(5) For the first year's sample, 64% (23) of the index children were rated as high in cognitive and communicational style on the basis of global ratings for the interview, and 36% (13) were rated low. In 53% (19) of the cases, siblings were rated high in cognitive style and 39% (14) were rated low (in 3 of the cases of ratings for siblings, ratings could not be made).

In the second year's study, 57% or 17 of the index children were rated high in cognitive style on the basis of global interview ratings, while 43% or 13 of the index children were rated low in cognitive style. In 47% or 14 of the ratings based on siblings' cognitive and communicational style, siblings were rated high and 33% or 10 of these ratings were low (in 20% or 6 of the families interviewed in the second year, a rating of siblings could not be made).

Mothers

(1) Of the 36 mothers or mother figures interviewed in the first year of our study, 35 were the natural mothers of the index children studied, and one was the maternal grandmother (in this case, the mother was deceased). In the second year, 28 mothers were present, one mother did not appear for the interview, and in one family, the grandmother who took care of the child was interviewed. In the latter instance, the natural mother was alive but did not live in the household.

(2) In Year I, 78% or 28 mothers interviewed were rated high in cognitive and communicational style, while 22% were rated low. In the second year's sample, 87% or 28 mothers were rated high and 10% were rated low. One case in the Year II sample could not be rated.

(3) Of the total sample in Form I, 33% of the mothers (12 cases) were born in a northern or western urban or suburban area; of these mothers, 9 were born in New York City. Sixty-one percent or 22 of the total sample of mothers were born in the South; 10 of these mothers in the urban South, and 12 in the rural South. The remaining 2 mothers in the sample reported that they were born in the Caribbean. In the Year II sample, 20% or 6 of the mothers interviewed were born in a northern or western urban or suburban area (all but one of these mothers were born in New York City). Twenty-two of the mothers (73% of the sample) were born in the South. Of these mothers, 17 came from the urban or

suburban South, and 5 came from the rural South. The remaining 2 mothers were born in the Caribbean.

(4) Mother's education as reported in the Interview I series, indicated that 1 mother had six years or less of formal schooling, 25% or 9 of the mothers had completed 7 to 9 years of schooling, 39% or 14 of the mothers had completed 10 to 11 years, while 33% or 12 mothers were high school graduates.

In the Year II sample, 1 of the mothers reported having completed six years or less of formal schooling; 6 mothers (20%) attended school from seven to nine years; 13 (43%) reported completing 10 to 11 years of school, and 10 of the mothers (33%) of the sample were high school graduates. Of these, one mother had attended some college.

(5) Thirty-three percent or 12 of the mothers interviewed in the first year of the study were employed at the time of the interview. Of those employed, 8 noted that they worked full-time, while the remaining 4 mothers worked part-time. Sixty-seven percent or 24 of the total sample were unemployed. Seventy percent or 21 of the Year II sample of mothers were employed at the time of the interview. Of this group, 14 mothers worked full-time, and 7 mothers worked part-time. The remaining 30% (9) of all mothers interviewed were unemployed.

(6) In the first year's interview, 47% or 17 of the mothers reported that they were not members of any groups or clubs. Twenty-five percent or 9 mothers indicated that they were very active in at least one group or club, and the remaining 28% or 10 mothers displayed a range from inactive to moderately active participation.

In Year II of the interview, 37% or 11 of the mothers reported that they did not hold memberships in any group or club. Another 37% indicated that they were very active members in at least one group or club. The remaining 23% or 7 mothers reported a range of activity from inactive to moderately active. One mother could not be rated.

(7) In regard to voting behavior, 67% or 24 of the mothers interviewed in Year I said that they vote in most or all elections, 19% or 7 mothers vote in some or few elections, and 14% or 5 mothers said that they do not vote at all. Of the mothers in the second year's sample, 60% or 18 said that they vote in most or all elections, while 17% or 5 mothers vote in some or few elections, and 20% or 6 mothers said that they do not vote. One mother could not be rated.

Fathers

(1) Although only a small proportion of the sample families for both years' interviews had fathers present in the household (Year I: 20% or 7; Year II: 40% or 12), and even though a smaller percentage of these families actually had the father present at the interview (Year I: 8% or 3; Year II: 10% or 3), it seemed of interest to investigate the characteristics of the fathers in the sample.

For the first year's sample of fathers, of the 29 fathers not living in the home, a fairly large percentage (31% or 9) were deceased. For the second year's sample, of the 18 fathers not living in the household, 17% or 3 fathers were deceased.

(2) On the basis of Year 1 interviews, of the 20 (living) fathers not residing in the home, 14 (70%) maintained contact with their children, 5 (25%) did not see the children, and in one case (5%) it could not be ascertained whether or not the father saw the children.

In 11 of the 14 sample I families where the father maintained contact with the children, the children had seen their father within a month of the time they were interviewed; children in 2 families had not seen their father from seven months to one year, while children in 1 family had not seen their father in over one year.

For the second year's sample, of the 15 (living) fathers not residing in the household, 12 (80%) maintained contact with the children and 3 (20%) did not see the children. In these 12 families where the children saw the father, 10 had seen him within a month of the interview. For the remaining 2 families, the children had seen their father within 1 to 6 months prior to the interview.

(3) For the first year sample of 7 fathers living in the home, 4 were born in the rural South, and the remaining 3 were born in a northern or western urban or suburban area (two of these fathers were born in New York City). In the second year's sample, of the 12 fathers living in the home, 6 were born in the South (5 in the suburban South and in the rural South). Four fathers were born in a northern or western urban or suburban area (3 fathers were born in New York City). An additional 2 fathers were born in the Caribbean.

(4) Data collected on fathers' schooling in Year I indicated that of the 7 fathers present in the home, 1 had completed 0-6 years of formal schooling, 2 had completed 10-11 years of schooling, and 3 were high school graduates (in 1 case there was no response). Of the 12 fathers living at home in the Year II sample, 1 father had completed 0-6 years of formal schooling, 4 had completed 7-9 years of schooling, 3 had completed 10-11 years of schooling, and 4 were high school graduates.

(5) It should be noted that in both samples (Forms I and II), all fathers residing in the home were employed full-time.

Housing

(1) Of the 36 families interviewed in the first year's study, 28 (78%) lived in old, unrenovated apartment buildings with five or more units and 19% lived in renovated or new buildings (6 out of the 7 cases in this category were public housing). The type of building could not be described for one family who were interviewed in a relative's home.

Of the 30 families interviewed the second year, 28 or 93% lived in old, unrenovated apartment buildings with five or more units. The remaining two families dwelled in a renovated or new building (of these, one dwelling was public housing).

(2) The interviewers rated both the condition of the building and the house interior immediately following each interview. Half (18) of the buildings visited in the first year's sample were rated as poor, 7 or 19% were rated as good, and 4 or 11% were rated as excellent (19% or 7 of the buildings were considered unratable). House interiors were rated as poor for 3, good for 19 or 53%, and excellent for 5 or 14% of the families in the sample (the interviewers were unable to rate 25% or 9 of the house interiors).

Of the buildings visited the second year, 23 or 77% were rated as in poor condition, 4 or 13% were rated as good, and 1 building as being in excellent condition (two buildings were unratable). House interiors were rated as poor for 20% or 6 of the sample families, good for 70% or 21 of the families, and excellent for 3 of the families.

(3) Concerning the mobility of the first year's sample over the past fifteen years, of the 36 families interviewed, 26 or 72% reported having moved two times or less in the past fifteen years while 9 or 25% of the families had moved more than two times in the past fifteen

years. Number of moves for one family could not be ascertained.

For the second year's sample, 23 or 77% of the families had moved two times or less in the past fifteen years while 7 or 23% of the families had moved more than two times in the past fifteen years.

(4) Of the 29 families in the first year's study who had moved at least once in the past fifteen years, 83% of them indicated upward mobility strivings, e.g., moving for more space or better facilities. Responses of 11% of this sample of 29 indicated that moves were based solely on reality circumstances, e.g., their building was about to be torn down, their mother and father were separating, etc. (6% of this sample could not be rated on this dimension). Of the 25 families in this sample who had moved at least once in the past fifteen years, the responses of 72% indicated upward mobility strivings; responses of 12% indicated that moves were based solely on reality circumstances (16% of the sample could not be rated on this dimension).

(5) In their present household arrangements, the first year's families occupied a median number of 4.8 rooms. In the second year's group of families, median number of rooms occupied was also 4.8.

(6) Of the total sample of families in the first year, 19 or 53% reported having lived in their present apartment for five years or less, while 17 or 47% of the families reported having lived in their present apartment for more than five years. In the second year, 50% of the sample families reported having lived in their present apartments for five years or less, and 50% lived in their apartments for more than five years.

(7) In the first year's sample, where the family was able to compare its present apartment with a previous apartment (31 instances), 83%

felt more satisfied with their present apartment, 10% felt less satisfied, and 7% felt the same. In the second year's sample, where families were able to compare their present apartment with a previous apartment (25 instances), 52% felt more satisfied with their present apartment, 40% felt less satisfied, and 8% felt the same.

(8) In the first group of families, 29 or 80% expressed the desire to move again. Examples of reasons given for this desire included poor neighborhood conditions, poor housing conditions, as well as a need for more space. In the second year's families, 26 or 87% expressed the desire to move again.

The Two Samples: Some Similarities and Differences

The foregoing presentation permits general comparisons between the two populations. The samples are quite similar from several points of view. For example, both samples had the same proportion of Black and Puerto Rican families, and were comparable in family composition and various interview characteristics. In both samples, several background variables in regard to parental figures were also similar. Mothers from both samples had the same amount of education, and fathers were similar in education, employment patterns, place of birth, and the frequency with which fathers not living in the home see their children. Responses from the index children for both samples indicate similar occupational interests, and in general, these children received a similar proportion of high and low ratings on cognitive style. Sample families across the two years of the study also showed similarities with regard to number of rooms in the household, number of years in present apartment, and number of times they had moved in a fifteen year period.

Some of the differences between the samples should also be noted.

In the second year's sample, there was a greater percentage of fathers residing in the home at the time of the interview. It is also noteworthy that 31% of all fathers from the first year's sample were deceased, as compared to 17% deceased among families in the second year of the study.

Mothers interviewed with Form II were more likely to have been born in the South. They also tended to hold a greater number of memberships in clubs and groups and tended to be more active members than Year I mothers. Further, mothers for Year II were far more likely to be employed at the time of the interview. Seventy percent of these mothers were employed at the time of the interview, while only 33% of sample I mothers were employed at the time of the interview. On the whole, mothers in the second year sample were rated higher in cognitive and communicational style.

Slight sample differences were observed between the children in the two samples (index as well as siblings). Siblings interviewed with Form II more frequently indicated professional occupational aspirations. Also, in Form II, all children tended to have more active memberships in groups or clubs. Furthermore, a greater number of Form II index children indicated that they read books other than school books.

Interviewers noted that 78% of the families in the first year's sample lived in old, unrenovated buildings, while 19% lived in a renovated or new building. In contrast, interviewers noted that 93% of families in the second year of the study lived in old, unrenovated buildings, with only 7% in renovated or new apartment houses. A number of additional sample differences emerged concerning various housing variables. It is conceivable that many of these differences may be related to the type of building lived in by the families. For example, ratings made by the interviewers of the condition of the buildings and house interiors were lower for Year II families. Also, there were differences in the degree of satisfaction with the families' present apartment. In the first year, 83% of the families were more satisfied with their present apartment, and 10% were less satisfied. In the second year, 52% were more satisfied, and 40% were less satisfied. Regardless of these differences, however, a majority of families in both samples expressed the desire to move again.

The next chapter returns to interview data, but this time no longer from a descriptive but from an hypothesis-testing point of view. Overall, the samples seem sufficiently similar, it should be noted, to consider the possibility of combining or pooling at least some of the data from both years. That is, samples I and II appear to be drawn from the same general population.

Chapter 7

Findings in Connection with Hypotheses-Testing

The present chapter considers the basic questions explored in the current investigation. Appendix A describes findings based on the first year's study, but does not cover data explorations based on Form I interview material. It will be recalled (see Tables 10-12 in Appendix A) that our hypothesis in regard to expecting a positive relationship between high or low subject designations and ratings made of behavior in specially developed "cognitive style" sessions were not borne out. This was true for the extreme "high" or "low" groups as well as for the larger groups of "highs" and "lows" for both the Binet and Gates criteria of change, for both of two independent raters. Additional findings below based on an examination of both years' data will on occasion refer to the behavioral sessions. These are explained in detail in Appendix A of this report.

Appendix B (interview) data and additional core data (for both years separately) were transferred to IBM cards, and marginals and cross-tabulations were obtained for both years by IBM counter-sorter procedures. Additional punched data not included in Appendix B interview schedules of course included collateral material, such as family's ethnic background, sex of index child, school attended for the IDS program, date that index child entered program, initial Binet, Gates, PPVT scores, and high low status based on the changes in these scores, behavioral sessions ratings for Year I Ss, position with regard to the median of the distribution of ITPA composite scores (for Year II Ss only of course), the interview ratings, and all scores on the MCPS scales (for Year II Ss), etc.

Criterion measures were of course high or low status based on the change measures already described in preceding chapters. Intrinsic to the intent of the current investigations are the ratings based on the family interview procedures for both years. The description of findings below will begin with the foregoing considerations.

The bulk of the present chapter is concerned with examining the relationship of specific interview items and data with our high-low criteria. Not all items were explored. Elimination of certain items was based on careful a priori consideration based primarily on the marginal distributions that emerged. Carefully considered and planned before the actual "running" of the data was the collapsing and combining of coded parts. In many instances, the distribution of responses permitted comparisons based only on the extreme cases for each item. In other instances, however, collapsing coded parts seemed to yield the most reasonable cut-offs for comparison purposes. It was thus possible, for each item, to make decisions based on maximizing the N to be employed for analysis purposes.

Ns for High-Low Criteria and Statistical Methods Employed

For both phases of the Interview (Forms I and II), the Ns employed with regard to the basic high-low criteria differed according to whether or not interview items or rating scales were being examined. The following applied to both years of the study and concerns the basic high-low criteria employed:

Years I and II--rating scales vs. high-low criteria. As can be seen in Tables 13 and 14, the criteria when rating scales were examined consisted of high-low and very high--very low status for the Binet and Gates change score distributions (Year I) and the Binet and PPVT change score distributions (Year II). These were defined as those Ss falling within the upper and lower 30th percentiles for each measure for the very high and very low designations, and the upper and lower 40th percentiles for the high and low designations for each measure. In both Tables 13 and 14, it will be noted that the Ns for each comparison vary. This emerges as a function, for each comparison, of whether the S falls into the section of the criterion distribution required for inclusion in the comparison and whether he is or isn't a "can't rate" designation on the rating scales themselves.[2]

Years I and II--interview items vs. high-low criteria. All remaining comparisons employed position above or below the median on the basic high-low criteria for both years (Binet and Gates change scores and Binet and PPVT change scores). That is, "highs" were defined as those Ss falling above the median of the relevant distribution of change scores, while "lows" as below the median. This procedure was adopted because many items in both forms of the interview involved small numbers of cases. As a result, it was felt that using a truncated sample based on more extreme cut-offs of the distribution would result in loss of information concerning the relevant variables.

Statistical methods. With only a few exceptions, non-parametric statistical techniques were employed. This was necessitated by the nature of the distributions. Fourfold contingency tables were used in most cases. Thus, unless otherwise indicated, the analysis performed was a 2 X 2 chi square analysis, corrected by Yates procedures for small cell frequencies. Exceptions to the foregoing will be indicated when findings are presented. These consist essentially of comparisons in which it was possible to use t-tests. Note, analyses in connection with the rating scales (described immediately below) were based on dichotomization above and below the hypothetical midpoint of the rating scale. An Olivetti-Underwood Programma 101 was used for computing all analyses.

---

[2] Note, for both years, only Rater A's ratings were employed for analysis purposes. Good reliability findings made this possible.

Findings--Year I

Ratings Based on Family Behavior During Interview vs. Basic High-Low Criteria

All the ratings derived from the Form I interview procedure were found to bear no relationship to high-low status or to very high or very low status as defined by change scores for the Binet and Gates-McGinities measures. Results were consistently nonsignificant for these measures. Table 13 presents the Ns and chi-square values for the various comparisons we ran. It is thus seen that our primary hypotheses in Year I have not been confirmed. The remaining parts of this section consider more specific interview variables, demographic and otherwise.

Cross-Tabulations--Interview Items vs. Basic High-Low Criteria

The comparisons described below indicate the large number examined. Significant findings and suggestive trends for Form I are summarized in Tables 15 and 16. It should be of course noted that the number of significant findings obtained is not excessive--indeed might even be expected by chance--in the light of the large number of comparisons ran. Comparisons are roughly grouped by areas--demographic, interactive, etc. For each comparison, cut-off points are indicated as well as the total N involved for each comparison.

I. Background Information--Index Child. Three major items were investigated: sex, school, and date of entrance into the Institute program of the index child.

A. Sex. Males vs. females were cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N: 35)

(2) High-Low Gates status (N: 28)

(3) Each of two raters' global ratings of cognitive and communicational style based on the behavioral sessions (Ns: 29 and 30)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N: 36)

(5) Initial Stanford-Binet scores (end of Kindergarten, 1965) employing a t-test (N: 36)

(6) Initial Gates McGinitie Reading Test scores (end of first grade, 1966) also employing a t-test (N: 30)

The foregoing comparisons resulted in nonsignificant findings.

B. School child attends. The Public School (P.S. 68, 79, 90, or 175) attended by the index child was cross-tabulated with (2 x 4 contingency tables were used):

(1) High-Low Binet status (N: 35)

(2) High-Low Gates status (N: 28)

(3) Global rating of index child in interview (N:36)

The first comparison resulted in a nonsignificant finding.

A significant relationship (second comparison) emerged ($p < .05$), with P. S. 79 producing considerably more lows on the Gates criterion than the other schools.

The third comparison yielded a "trend." There was an indication for P.S. 90 to produce more Ss rated high on the global rating than the other schools ($p < .20 > .10$).

C. Date child entered IDS program. Dates were coded for those

Ss who entered in 1963 (prekindergarten) and 1964 (Kindergarten) resulting in a cutting-point based on Ss who completed 5 vs. 4 years of IDS classes. These designations were cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N: 35)

(2) High-Low Gates status (N: 28)

(3) Global rating of index child in interview (N:36)

(4) Initial Stanford-Binet scores (end of Kindergarten, 1965) employing a t-test (N: 36)

(5) Initial Gates McGinities Reading Test scores (end of first grade, 1966) employing a t-test (N: 29)

The foregoing comparisons all resulted in nonsignificant findings.

II. Interview Information: the number of persons present at the interview was dichotomized into 4 or fewer persons vs. 5 or more. These were cross-tabulated with the following:

(1) Global family rating (N: 36)

(2) Global rating of index child in interview (N:36)

(3) Global rating of siblings (N: 33)

(4) Rating for listening and attentional skills (N: 36)

(5) Rating for task furtherance (N: 36)

(6) Rating of conceptual level (N: 36)

(7) Rating of mode of communication (N: 36)

All but the last comparison yielded nonsignificant findings.

The last comparison yielded a trend: there was a tendency ($p < .20 > .10$) for families with fewer persons present to be rated higher in mode of communication than were the families with a greater number of persons present at the interview.

III. Demographic Data: family composition. Within this area four items were investigated: parental figures living in the household; number of permanent household residents; number of siblings older than the index child; and age of youngest child at home.

A. Parental figures living in the household was dichotomized into those instances in which only a mother figure lived in the household vs. those in which both parents lived in the household. These comparison groups were cross-tabulated with the following variables:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N: 35)

(2) High-Low Gates status (N: 28)

(3) Global rating of family (N: 36)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:36)

(5) Global rating of siblings (N: 33)

The foregoing comparisons all yielded nonsignificant findings.

B. Number of permanent household residents was collapsed into three major alternatives: 3-4 persons; 5-6 persons; and 7 or more persons (2 x 3 analyses were employed). These were compared with:

(1) Global rating of family (N:36)

(2) Global rating of the index child (N:36)

The foregoing comparisons all yielded nonsignificant findings.

C. Number of siblings older than the index child was collapsed into three major alternatives: none; 1-2; and 3 or more (2 x 3 analyses were employed). These were cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:35)

(2) High-Low Gates status (N:28)

(3) Each of two raters' global ratings of cognitive and communicational style based on the behavioral sessions (Ns: 29 and 30)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:36)

The foregoing comparisons all yielded nonsignificant findings.

D. Age of youngest child at home was collapsed into three major alternatives: infant to 5 years; 6-8 years; and 9-11 years (2 x 3 analyses were employed). These were cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:35)

(2) High-Low Gates status (N:28)

(3) Each of two rater's global ratings of cognitive and communicational style based on the behavioral sessions (Ns: 28 and 29)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:34)

The foregoing comparisons all yielded nonsignificant findings.

IV. Crowdedness and Housing. This area was represented primarily by the Crowdedness Ratio derived by dividing the number of permanent residents by the number of rooms in the apartment. Cut-offs established were: at least one room per person (N:17) vs. less than one room per person (N:18). This index was cross-tabulated with the following variables:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:34)

(2) High-Low Gates status (N:28)

(3) Global rating of index child in interview (N:35)

(4) Global rating of siblings (N:32)

(5) Global family rating (N:35)

(6) One rater's global ratings of cognitive and communicational style based on the behavioral sessions (N:30)

All but comparisons (3) and (6) yielded nonsignificant findings. For comparison (3), there was a tendency ($p < .10 > .05$) for less crowded conditions to be associated with higher ratings of the index child in the interview.

$.10 > p > .05$

For comparison (6), there was a trend ($p < .10 > .05$) for a higher rating of the index child in the behavioral sessions to be associated with more crowded conditions.

V. Family's Origins and Physical Mobility. This area was investigated with two major items: mother's birthplace and a cross-index for mothers born in the South only with the age they left their birthplace. The cross-index seemed to be important because of the number of mothers born in the South (N=22).

A. Mother's birthplace was dichotomized into those born in the North and those born in the South. This twofold classification was compared to:

(1) Global rating of mother (N:33)
(2) Global rating of family (N:34)
(3) High-Low Binet status (N:33)
(4) High-Low Gates status (N:27)
(5) Initial Binet scores (end of Kindergarten, 1965) employing a *t*-test (N:34)
(6) Initial Gates McGinitie Reading Test Scores (end of first grade, 1966) also employing a *t*-test (N:29)

All of the foregoing comparisons yielded nonsignificant findings.

B. Age mother left the South was split for those mothers who left the South 16 years of age and under and those mothers who left the South 17 years of age and over. This dichotomy was cross-tabulated with:

(1) Global rating of mother (N:22)
(2) High-Low Binet status (N:21)

(3) High-Low Gates status (N:17)

(4) Initial Binet scores (end of Kindergarten, 1965) employing a t-test (N:22)

(5) Initial Gates McGinitie Reading Test scores (end of first grade, 1966) also employing a t-test (N:18)

All of the foregoing comparisons but one (comparison 4) yielded nonsignificant findings.

For comparison (4), it was found ($p < .05$) that mothers who stayed in the South longer bore index children with higher initial Binet scores.

VI. Employment Patterns. The major item of interest in this area was whether the mother was working. This was dichotomized into those employed full or part-time, and those unemployed. This item was compared with:

(1) Global rating of mother (N:36)

(2) Global rating of family (N:36)

(3) High-Low Binet status (N:35)

(4) High-Low Gates status (N:28)

The foregoing comparisons yielded nonsignificant findings.

VII. Family's Health. This area was tapped by one item, Has the index child had to be absent from school for more than a few days in any one school year? The item was split on the basis of a No vs. Yes response. It was compared with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:35)

(2) High-Low Gates status (N:28)

(3) Behavioral session rating (Rater 1) of cognitive and communicational style (N:29)

(4) Behavioral session rating (Rater 2) of cognitive and communicational style (N:30)

Comparison (1) yielded a strong trend ($p < .10 > .05$). Index children who were absent for more than a few days during the year were found to be rated higher in terms of high-low Binet status than those who were not.

The remaining comparisons yielded nonsignificant findings.

VIII. Educational Aspirations. This area was tapped by the following items: consistency between the index child's and mother's aspirations; accuracy of mother's schooling estimate for siblings--including index child; last grade mother completed; and location of mother's schooling.

A. Consistency between mother's aspirations for index child and index child's own aspirations. The cut-offs for these items were responses of index and mother which were consistent, e.g., both professional, and responses of index and mother which were not consistent (discrepant). This dichotomy was compared with:

(1) Global rating of index child in interview (N:22)

(2) Global rating of mother (N:22)

(3) High-Low Binet status (N:21)

(4) High-Low Gates status (N:18)

The foregoing comparisons yielded nonsignificant findings.

B. Accuracy of mother's schooling estimate for index child. Three alternatives were employed for this item. Responses that indicated accurate estimates, responses that indicated reasonably accurate estimates, and those responses indicating little or no accuracy (2 x 3 analyses were computed). These classifications were compared with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:18)

(2) High-Low Gates status (N:15)

(3) Global rating of index child in interview (N:19)

(4) Global rating of mother (N:19)

(5) Mother's role in maintaining rules of effective communication (N:19)

(6) Global rating of family (N:19)

All but comparison (4) yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (4) yielded a trend ($p < .20 > .10$): mothers rated higher tended to have greater accuracy in their estimates of schooling.

C. Accuracy of mother's schooling estimate for siblings (including index child). Again, this item's cut-offs were: accurate, reasonably accurate, and little or no accuracy, resulting in a 2 x 3 analysis. These were compared with:

(1) Global rating of siblings (N:20)

The comparison yielded a nonsignificant finding.

D. Last grade mother completed. Cut-offs for this item were: 0-9 years of schooling; 10-11 years of schooling; and 12 years of schooling or high school graduation (2x3 analyses were employed). Cross-tabulations were run with the following variables:

(1) Global rating of mother (N:36)

(2) Global rating of index child in interview (N:36)

(3) Global rating of siblings (N:33)

(4) Global rating of family (N:36)

(5) High-Low Binet status (N:35)

(6) High-Low Gates status (N:28)

(7) Behavioral session rating (Rater 1) (N:29)

(8) Behavioral session rating (Rater 2) (N:30)

(9) Initial Binet scores--two comparisons employing t-tests, 0-9 vs. 12 years and 0-9 vs. 10-11 years (N:29)

(10) Initial Gates scores--two comparisons employing t-tests, see above (N:17)

The foregoing comparisons, with the exception of comparisons (3) and (4), yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (3) resulted in a significant finding ($\underline{p} < .05$): siblings rated high in cognitive style came from families with mothers who completed high school.

Comparison (4) resulted in a trend ($\underline{p} < .10 > .05$): a positive association was found between number of years of mother's schooling and global family rating.

E. Location of mother's schooling. Cut-offs for this item were: Northern or western urban or suburban (including New York City) vs. Southern (urban and rural combined). This dichotomy was cross-tabulated with:

(1) Global rating of mother (N:32)

Findings were nonsignificant.

IX. Community Participation versus Isolation. Items reflecting group membership in the community were of primary interest in this area.

A. Does mother belong to clubs or groups. The dichotomy for this item was: no memberships in any clubs vs. moderately/very active membership in at least one group or club. These were cross-tabulated with:

(1) Global rating of mother (N:31)
(2) Global rating of family (N:31)
(3) High-Low Binet status (N:31)
(4) High-Low Gates status (N:24)

The foregoing comparisons all resulted in nonsignificant findings.

B. Do children belong to clubs. Three cut-offs were employed: none or most of the children do not belong to any clubs or groups; all children are members of at least one club and are moderately or very active; and all children belong to clubs in which they are all very active (2 x 3 analyses were employed). These were compared with:

(1) Global rating of index child in interview (N:36)

(2) Global rating of siblings (N:33)

(3) Global rating of family (N:36)

(4) High-Low Binet status (N:35)

(5) High-Low Gates status (N:28)

(6) Behavioral session rating--Rater 1 (N:29)

(7) Behavioral session rating--Rater 2 (N:30)

All of the foregoing comparisons resulted in nonsignificant findings. Comparison (2), however, yielded a trend ($p < .20 > .10$). Siblings who were more highly rated in cognitive style tended to show less participation in clubs than children who were rated low.

The next area of the interview analysis incorporates information concerning the availability and encouragement of verbal interchange as well as reading encouragement in the home. Family structure, i.e., role assignment, is included. We have called this general area the interactive aspects of our interview content.

X. Availability of Adults for Verbal Interchange. Items in this area included those reflecting the frequency of the index child's contact with adults, family verbal interchanges, and ratings of stability of the eating arrangement in the home.

A. Frequency of index child's contact with adults. The dichotomy for this item was daily vs. rarely, i.e., once a month or every few weeks. These were compared with:

(1) Global rating of index child in interview (N:18)

(2) High-Low Binet status (N:20)

(3) High-Low Gates status (N:18)

This item was also run against daily vs. weekly contact, and these were compared with:

(1) Global rating of index child in interview (N:20)

(2) High-Low Binet status (N:20)

(3) High-Low Gates status (N:16)

All of the foregoing yielded nonsignificant findings.

B. Does family have conversations at meals. For this item, yes responses were compared with combined alternatives for responses indicating that sometimes there were conversations, or that there were no conversations at all. This split was run against:

(1) Global rating of index child in interview (N:36)

(2) Global rating of siblings (N:33)

(3) Global rating of family (N:36)

(4) Rating of listening and attention skills (N:36)

(5) Rating of transitions and sequencing (N:36)

(6) Rating of mother's role in maintaining the rules of effective communication (N:35)

(7) High-Low Binet status (N:35)

(8) High-Low Gates status (N:28)

(9) Behavioral session ratings for both raters (Ns:29 and 30)

All of the foregoing yielded nonsignificant findings.

$.20 > p > .10$

However, there was a trend in comparison (9) ($p < .20 > .10$): index children who were rated higher tended to come from families where there were conversations at mealtimes.

C. Rating of the stability of the family's eating arrangements.

For this item, the dichotomy employed was: those families which reported no subgroup arrangements at meals vs. those families that reported consistent subgroup arrangements. This was compared with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:30)

(2) High-Low Gates status (N:23)

(3) Global rating of family (N:31)

(4) Behavioral session rating--Rater 1 (N:24)

(5) Behavioral session rating--Rater 2 (N:25)

All of the foregoing resulted in nonsignificant findings.

D. Does mother like to be asked questions (mothers' answers). This item was dichotomized into yes vs. responses of sometimes yes, sometimes no, or no. These were compared with:

(1) Global rating of mother (N:36)

(2) Mothers role in maintaining rules of effective communication (N:35)

(3) Global rating of index child in interview (N:36)

(4) Global rating of family (N:36).

(5) High-Low Binet status (N:35)

(6) High-Low Gates status (N:28)

Three of the six comparisons (1), (2), and (5) yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (3) indicated a significant relationship ($p < .02$) between the index child's interview rating and whether mother liked to be asked questions (positive relationship). $.10 > p > .05$

Comparison (4) yielded a trend ($p < .10 > .05$): families that received higher cognitive style ratings tended to have mothers who indicated that they liked being asked questions.

Comparison (6) yielded a significant finding ($p < .05$): mothers who liked being asked questions produced index children who were "highs" on the Gates change criterion.

E. Does mother like to be asked questions--children's assessment. For this item comparison groups were divided into those families in which all the children agreed on a yes response vs. those families in which the children all said no or some said yes and some no. This split was compared with:

(1) Global rating of mother (N:32)

(2) Mother's role in maintaining rules of effective communication (N:31)

(3) Global rating of family (N:32)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:32)

(5) Each of two rater's behavioral session ratings (Ns:26 and 26)

(6) High-Low Binet status (N;31)

(7) High-Low Gates status (N:25)

(8) Global rating of siblings (N:30)

All of the comparisons but (4) and (7) yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (4) yielded a promising trend ($p < .10 > .05$): index children received higher cognitive style ratings when they themselves felt their mothers liked to be asked questions.

Comparison (7) yielded a highly significant finding ($p < .001$): index children who thought their mother liked to be asked questions had the largest change scores on the Gates criterion.

F. What kinds of questions do children ask. This was split on three dimensions: questions pertaining to play or recreation; questions which pertain to immediately useful information; and questions which are information-seeking primarily in academic areas (2 x 3 analyses were employed). These were compared with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:17)

(2) High-Low Gates status (N:15)

(3) Global rating of siblings (N:17)

(4) Rating of mother's role in maintaining rules of effective communication (N:16)

(5) Rating of attention and listening skills (N:17)

All of the foregoing resulted in nonsignificant findings.

G. Does it bother mother if children talk when she's working around the house--children's assessment. Yes responses (most or all of the children) for this item were compared with no responses (most or all of the children) for the following variables:

(1) Global rating of mother (N:27)

(2) Mother's role in maintaining rules of effective communication (N:27)

(3) Family global rating (N:27)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:27)

(5) High-Low Binet status (N:29)

(6) High-Low Gates status (N:23)

All but comparison (1) yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (1) yielded a trend ($p < .10 > .05$): mothers whose children claimed were bothered by their talk when they (mothers) work around the house tended to receive higher ratings of cognitive style than mothers reputedly not so bothered.

H. Does it bother mother if children talk when she's shopping--children's assessment. Yes vs. no responses for this item were compared with:

(1) Global rating of mother (N:25)
(2) Mother's role in maintaining rules of effective communication (N:24)
(3) Global rating of family (N:25)
(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:25)
(5) High-Low Binet status (N:26)
(6) High-Low Gates status (N:21)

All of the foregoing comparisons but comparison (5) yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (5) yielded a trend ($p < .20 > .10$): Index children who tended to be "highs" on the Binet change criterion came from families where the children said the mother is not bothered if children talk while she's shopping.

XI. Availability of Reading Material and Encouragement of Reading. This area was tapped with the item, Does anyone tell stories to the children. Responses of no vs. yes were cross-tabulated with:

(1) Global rating of index child in interview (N:36)
(2) Global rating of siblings (N:33)
(3) High-Low Binet status (N:35)
(4) High-Low Gates status (N:28)

The foregoing all yielded nonsignificant findings.

XII. Parent's Knowledge of Activities and Whereabouts of Children. Mother's recollection of the index child's activities as well as school-age siblings' activities were the primary items of interest in this area.

A. Mother's recollection of index child's activities. The alternatives for this item were dichotomized into clear recollection vs. vague or no recollection. These were compared with:

(1) Global rating of mother (N:34)

(2) Global rating of index child in interview (N:34)

(3) High-Low Binet status (N:33)

(4) High-Low Gates status (N:26)

The foregoing yielded nonsignificant findings.

B. Mother's recollection of school-age siblings' activities. The dichotomized cut-offs were again, clear recollection vs. vague or no recollection. These were compared with:

(1) Global rating of mother (N:29)

(2) Global rating of siblings (N:29)

There were nonsignificant findings for both of the foregoing comparisons.

XIII. Role Assignment and Stability of Roles in the Family.

A. Do children have stable role assignments. Comparison groups were defined by yes responses vs. no responses. These were compared with:

(1) Global rating of family (N:26)

(2) Global rating of index child in interview (N:26)

(3) Global rating of siblings (N:23)

(4) Mother's role in maintaining rules of effective communication (N:25)

(5) Behavioral session ratings of index child for each of two raters (N's:19 and 20)

(6) High-Low Binet status (N:25)

(7) High-Low Gates status (N:21)

None of the foregoing comparisons yielded significant findings.

B. *How does role assignment work out* was dichotomized into two categories: most children usually do their job vs. the combined alternatives, sometimes it works out or it does not work out at all. These were cross-tabulated with:

(1) Global rating of family (*N*:36)
(2) Global rating of mother (*N*:36)
(3) Mother's role in maintaining rules of effective communication (*N*:35)
(4) Behavioral session ratings of index child for each of two raters (*N*'s:29 and 30)
(5) High-Low Binet status (*N*:35)
(6) High-Low Gates status (*N*:28)

None of the foregoing yielded significant findings.

C. *Why does mother feel that family members should be responsible for doing different things around the house*. This item was dichotomized into those responses that stressed learning and training vs. those that did not. This was compared with:

(1) Global rating of mother (*N*:35)
(2) Global rating of family (*N*:35)
(3) Global rating of index child in interview (*N*:35)
(4) High-Low Binet status (*N*:34)
(5) High-Low Gates status (*N*:27)

None of the foregoing yielded significant findings.

Findings--Year II

Ratings Based on Family Behavior During Interview vs. Basic High-Low Criteria

Findings based on Form II comparisons of ratings based on the family interview and basic high-low data with regard to the index children are presented in Table 14. Although there were no significant findings based on the usual criteria, two reasonably strong trends emerged--both in the expected direction. Ratings based on Mode of Communication bear a strong and positive relationship to High-Low Binet status ($p < .10 > .05$), as defined by the upper and lower 40th percentiles on the Binet discrepancy score distribution. The *phi* correlation coefficient derived on the basis of the chi square value is .33. Table 14 also shows that the Global Rating for Siblings also bears a strong and positive relationship to the PPVT extreme (very high--very low) critrrion ($p < .10 > .05$) defined by the upper and lower 30th percentiles of the PPVT change scores distribution. The *phi* correlation coefficient based on the chi square value in this case was found to be .47.

Cross-Tabulations--Personality and Language Ability Scores vs. Interview Ratings, High-Low Criteria, and Each Other

I. Missouri Children's Picture Series. Note, MCPS scores were split at the median of the distribution of scores for each scale.

A. MCPS Conformity scores were compared to:

(1) Global rating of family (N:30)

(2) Global rating of index child in interview (N:30)

(3) Global rating of siblings (N:24)

(4) Rating of mode of communication (N:30)

(5) Rating of listening and attention skills (N:30)

(6) Rating of task furtherance (N:30)

(7) Rating of conceptual level (N:30)

(8) High-Low Binet status (N:28)

(9) High-Low PPVT status (N:30)

All but comparisons (2) and (4) yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (2) findings showed a significant positive relationship ($p < .05$) between the Global rating of the index child in the interview and MCPS Conformity scores in that children rated higher in cognitive style tended to be more conforming on the MCPS scale.

Comparison (4) yielded a trend ($p < .10 > .05$): families rated higher in mode of communication tended to produce index children who scored higher in MCPS Conformity.

B. MCPS Maturity scores were compared to:

(1) Global rating of family (N:28)

(2) Global rating of index child in interview (N:28)

(3) Global rating of siblings (N:23)

(4) Rating of mode of communication (N:28)

(5) Rating of listening and attention skills (N:28)

(6) Rating of task furtherance (N:28)

(7) Rating of conceptual level (N:28)

(8) High-Low Binet status (N:27)

(9) High-Low PPVT status (N:28)

All but comparison (7) yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (7) resulted in a trend ($p < .20 > .10$): children scoring as more mature on the MCPS tended to come from families rated higher on conceptual level.

C. MCPS Aggressivity scores were compared to:

(1) Global rating of family (N:26)

(2) Global rating of index child in interview (N:26)

(3) Global rating of siblings (N:22)

(4) Rating of mode of communication (N:26)

(5) Rating of listening and attention skills (N:26)

(6) Rating of task furtherance (N:26)

(7) Rating of conceptual level (N:26)

(8) High-Low Binet status (N:23)

(9) High-Low PPVT status (N:25)

Comparisons (4), (5), (7), and (9) yielded nonsignificant findings Comparison (2) yielded a significant finding. The remaining comparisons yielded "trends."

Comparison (2) resulted in a finding significant at the $<.05$ level: index children rated higher in cognitive style in the interview were significantly lower in MCPS Aggressivity.

Comparison (1) suggested a tendency for global family ratings to be inversely related ($p < .20 > .10$) to MCPS Aggressivity in that families rated lower in conceptual and communicative style tended to produce index children higher in aggressivity.

Comparison (3) indicated a trend ($p < .20 > .10$) for global ratings of siblings to be inversely related to MCPS Aggressivity scores in that index children scoring lower in MCPS Aggressivity tended to have siblings rated higher in cognitive style.

Comparison (6) also resulted in a suggestive inverse trend ($p < .20 > .10$) for index children lower in MCPS Aggressivity to come from families who were rated higher in task furtherance.

And finally, comparison (8) also yielded a trend ($p < .20 > .10$) for index children with the greatest gains on the Binet criterion to tend to score higher on MCPS Aggressivity.

D. MCPS Inhibition scores were compared with:

(1) Global rating of family (N:30)
(2) Global rating of index child in interview (N:30)
(3) Global rating of siblings (N:24)
(4) Rating of mode of communication (N:30)
(5) Rating of listening and attention skills (N:30)
(6) Rating of task furtherance (N:30)
(7) Rating of conceptual level (N:30)
(8) High-Low Binet status (N:28)
(9) High-Low PPVT status (N:30)

All but comparison (4) yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (4) resulted in a suggestive inverse trend ($p < .20 > .10$): index children scoring high in MCPS Inhibition tended to come from families rated low in mode of communication.

E. MCPS Hyperactivity scores were compared with:

(1) Global rating of family (N:30)
(2) Global rating of index child in interview (N:30)
(3) Global rating of siblings (N:24)
(4) Rating of mode of communication (N:30)
(5) Rating of listening and attention skills (N:30)
(6) Rating of task furtherance (N:30)
(7) Rating of conceptual level (N:30)
(8) High-Low Binet status (N:28)
(9) High-Low PPVT status (N:30)

All comparisons but comparison (8) yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (8) resulted in a trend ($p < .20 > .10$) for index children who scored high in MCPS Hyperactivity to show the greatest gains on the Binet criterion.

II. Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability. Note, cut-off points for these scores were taken at the median of the distribution of composite (or total) scores for this instrument. This dichotomy was compared with:

(1) Global rating of family (N:28)
(2) Global rating of index child in interview (N:28)
(3) Global rating of siblings (N:23)
(4) Rating of mode of communication (N:28)
(5) Rating of listening and attention skills (N:28)
(6) Rating of task furtherance (N:28)
(7) Rating of conceptual level (N:28)
(8) High-Low Binet status (N:26)
(9) High-Low PPVT status (N:28)

Comparison (8) yielded a highly significant finding ($p < .01$): index children who made the greatest gains on the Binet criterion scored high on the ITPA.

Additional suggestive trends appeared (comparisons 3, 4, 5, and 7) for high ITPA scorers to come from families: in which siblings were rated high in cognitive style ($p < .10 > .05$); which were rated high in mode of communication ($p < .20 > .10$); which were rated high in listening and attention skills ($p < .20 > .10$); and which were rated high in conceptual level ($p < .20 > .10$).

III. MCPS vs. ITPA. The cut-offs noted above were employed when the ITPA composite score was compared with the following MCPS scores:

(1) MCPS Conformity scale (N:28)

(2) MCPS Maturity scale (N:26)

(3) MCPS Aggressivity scale (N:24)

(4) MCPS Inhibition scale (N:28)

(5) MCPS Hyperactivity scale (N:28)

The foregoing comparisons all yielded nonsignificant findings.

Cross-Tabulations--Interview Items vs. Basic High-Low Criteria and Personality and Language Scores

I. Background Information--Index Child. As with Form I, three major items were explored: sex, school, and date of entrance into the Institute program of the index child.

A. Sex. Males vs. females were cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:28)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:29)

(3) Global rating of index child in interview (N:30)

(4) Initial Binet status (N:29)

(5) Initial PPVT status (N:30)

Comparison (5) yielded a significant finding ($p < .01$) in that males scored significantly higher in initial PPVT status than females.

The remaining comparisons yielded nonsignificant findings.

B. School child attends. The Public School (68, 79, 175, or 200) attended by the index child was cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:28)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:30)

(3) Global rating of index child in interview (N:30)

Comparisons (1) and (3) yeilded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (2) resulted in a trend ($p < .20 > .10$) for attendance at P. S. 58 to be related to higher gains on the PPVT criterion.

C. Date child entered IDS program. Dates were coded for those entering the program in 1964 (prekindergarten) and 1965 (kindergarten) resulting in a cutting-point based on Ss who completed 5 vs. 4 years of IDS classes. These designations were cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:28)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:30)

(3) Initial Binet status (N:29)

(4) Initial PPVT status (N:30)

All but comparison (2) resulted in nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (2) yielded a trend ($p < .20 > .10$) for earlier entrants (1964) achieving smaller gains on the PPVT change criterion.

II. Interview Information: the number of persons present at the interview was dichotomized into 4 or fewer persons present vs. 5 or more. These were cross-tabulated with the following:

(1) Global rating of siblings (N:24)

(2) Global rating of the index child in interview (N:30)

(3) Global rating of family (N:30)

(4) Rating of mode of communication (N:30)

(5) Rating of listening and attention skills (N:30)

(6) Rating of task furtherance (N:30)

(7) Rating of abstractness, elaboration and clarity (N:30)

Comparison (3) yielded a significant finding ($p < .05$): the fewer the number of persons at the interview, the higher the global rating of that family.

Comparison (1, 2, and 4) yielded trends in that the fewer the number of persons at the interview, the higher were the following ratings: global rating of siblings ($p < .20 > .10$); global rating of index child ($p < .10 > .05$); and rating of mode of communication ($p < .20 > .10$).

The remaining comparisons were nonsignificant.

III. *Demographic Data: family composition*. Within this area, three items were investigated: parental figures living in the household; number of permanent household residents; and number of siblings older than the index child.

A. *Parental figures living in the household* was dichotomized into those in which a mother figure only lived in the household vs. those in which both parents lived in the household. These comparisons were cross-tabulated with the following variables:

(1) High-Low Binet status (*N*:28)
(2) High-Low PPVT status (*N*:30)
(3) Global rating of index child in interview (*N*:30)
(4) Global rating of siblings (*N*:24)
(5) Global rating of family (*N*:30)

None of the foregoing yielded significant findings.

B. *Number of permanent household residents* was collapsed into, for comparison (1) below 2 to 4 persons vs. 5 or more. For comparisons (2) and (3), three alternatives were employed (2 x 3 analyses): 2-4 persons; 5 or 6 persons; and 7-9 persons. This item was compared to:

(1) Number of persons present at interview (*N*:30)
(2) Global rating of family (*N*:30)
(3) Global rating of index child in interview (*N*:30)

Comparison (1) resulted in a significant, positive relationship

($p < .02$) as migh be expected.

The remaining comparisons yielded nonsignificant findings.

C. Number of siblings older than index child was collapsed into none or only one sibling older than the index child vs. three or more children older than the index child. This dichotomy was compared with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (*N*:18)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (*N*:20)

(3) Global rating of index child in interview (*N*:20)

The first two comparisons yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (3) yielded a trend ($p < .20 > .10$) for none or one sibling older than index child to be associated with higher global ratings for that index child.

IV. Crowdedness and Housing.[3] Once again, this area was represented primarily by a Crowdedness Ratio derived by dividing the number of permanent residents by the number of rooms in the apartment. This was then dichotomized into instances in which there was at least one room per person (*N*:11) vs. those in which there was less than one room available per person (*N*:19). This dichotomy was cross-tabulated with the following:

(1) High-Low Binet status (*N*:28)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (*N*:30)

(3) ITPA Composite score (*N*:28)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (*N*:30)

(5) Global rating of siblings (*N*:24)

(6) Global rating of family (*N*:30)

None of the foregoing comparisons yielded significant findings.

---

[3] An additional item, expressions of greater satisfaction with present apartment vs. expressions of less satisfaction were run against global rating of family (*N*:23). Results were nonsignificant.

V. Employment Patterns.[4] The major item of interest in this area was whether the mother was working. This was dichotomized into those employed full-time vs. those who were unemployed. This dichotomy was compared with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:21)
(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:23)
(3) Global rating of the index child in interview (N:23)
(4) Global rating of family (N:23)

All of the foregoing comparisons were nonsignificant.

VI. Family's Health. This area was tapped by one item, dichotomized into children who were either absent from school for more than a few days during the year preceding the interview or not absent from school during this time. This dichotomy was compared with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:28)
(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:30)
(3) Global rating of the index child in interview (N:30)

None of the foregoing comparisons yielded significant findings.

VII. Mother's Education; Aspirations of and for Children. All of the items in this area that were examined with regard to Form I could not be explored for Form II because of the nature of the distributions obtained. For example, consistency between mother's occupational aspirations for the index child and the index child's own aspirations could not be examined. Items in this area for the current analysis included:

---

[4] When Form I results were presented, section V presented findings in connection with the Family's Origins and Physical Mobility, based essentially on mother's birthplace and age mother left the south. These were not found possible to examine in connection with Form II because in the first instance, it was found that most of the mothers were born in the South, and in the second instance, most of the mothers were 17 years of age or older, making a "split" for analysis purposes not feasible.

mother's occupational aspirations for the index child; index child's occupational aspiration; and the last grade the mother completed.

A. *Mother's occupational aspiration for index child.* These responses were dichotomized into professional aspirations vs. the response that she wants the child to choose his own job. This was cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (*N*:20)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (*N*:21)

The foregoing comparisons yielded nonsignificant findings.

B. *Index child's occupational aspiration.* For this item, professional aspirations vs. all other responses were dichotomized, and this was cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (*N*:24)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (*N*:25)

(3) Global rating of the index child in interview (*N*:25)

The foregoing comparisons yielded nonsignificant findings.

C. *Last grade mother completed.* Two sets of collapsed codes were cross-tabulated with the following variables. The first, a more extreme dichotomy, was: mothers who completed 0-9 years of formal schooling vs. those who completed 12 years; and the larger classification of mothers who had 0-11 years of formal schooling vs. those who were high school graduates. The *N*s for each cross-tabulation for the foregoing appear following the relevant variable.

(1) High-Low Binet status (*N*s:15, 28)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (*N*s:27,30)

(3) ITPS composite score (*N*s:17, 28)

(4) Global rating of the index child in interview (*N*s:17, 30)

(5) Global rating of family (Ns:17, 30)

(6) Initial Binet scores (Ns:16, 29)

(7) Initial PPVT scores (Ns:17, 30)

None of the foregoing comparisons yielded significant findings. However, there were some trends.

When extremes were compared (0-9 vs. 12 or more years of formal schooling), for comparison (4) there was a suggestion ($p < .10 > .05$) that mothers with less schooling tended to produce index children more frequently rated high in cognitive style.

When the larger group of mothers was examined (0-11 years of schooling vs. those who were high school graduates), comparison (3) yielded a trend ($p < .10 > .05$): there was a strong positive association between grade the mother completed and composite ITPA score; that is, more educated mothers tended to bear index children with higher ITPA scores.

VIII. Community Participation versus Isolation. This area was tapped by three items: does mother belong to clubs or groups; do children belong to clubs; and frequency of mother's contact with friends and relatives.

A. Does mother belong to clubs or groups. Two sets of dichotomizations were cross-tabulated with the three variables listed below. These were: no memberships in any group or club vs. active membership (extreme comparison); and no or inactive membership in any group or club vs. moderate or active membership. The Ns in these comparisons (extremes and larger group) appear after the variables below:

(1) Global family rating (Ns:22, 29)

(2) High-Low Binet status (Ns:21, 27)

(3) High-Low PPVT status (Ns:22, 29)

None of the above comparisons yielded significant findings.

B. Do children belong to clubs. The responses to this item were dichotomized into: none of the children belong to any club or group vs. all children are active in at least one club or group. This was cross-tabulated with the following variables:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:22)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:24)

(3) Global rating of index child in interview (N:24)

(4) Global rating of siblings (N:18)

None of the foregoing comparisons yielded significant findings.

C. Frequency of mother's contact with friends or relatives. Responses here were dichotomized into daily contact vs. less frequent contact (three times a week or less). This was compared with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:26)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:28)

(3) Global family rating (N:28)

Again, none of the foregoing yielded significant findings.

The next area of the interview analysis incorporates information concerning the availability and encouragement of verbal interchanges as well as reading encouragement in the home. This general area, which we call the interactive area, also includes items concerning family structure and role assignment.

IX. Availability of Adults for Verbal Interchange. This area includes items that are slightly different from those covered in the Form I analysis.

A. Does index child talk to adults. This item was dichotomized into yes vs. no responses. These were run against:

(1) ITPA composite score (N:28)

(2) High-Low Binet status (N:28)

(3) High-Low PPVT status (N:30)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:30)

The first three comparisons yielded nonsignificant findings. Comparison (4), however, yielded a significant finding ($p < .05$): index children who said that they talk to adults were rated higher in cognitive and communicational style.

B. Rating of the stability of the family's eating arrangements. Extremes of ratings were employed in these comparisons--that is, ratings of stable eating arrangements were split from ratings indicating unstable eating arrangements. This dichotomy was run against the following variables:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:17)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:17)

(3) ITPA composite scores (N:15)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:17)

(5) Global rating of family (N:17)

Only comparison (1) yielded a significant finding ($p < .05$): ratings of stable eating arrangements were significantly associated with families in which the index child achieved the greatest gains on the Binet criterion.

C. Does mother (parents) like to be asked questions (children's assessment). Responses here were dichotomized into most or all children agree yes vs. most or all children agree no. These were cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:22)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:24)

(3) ITPA composite scores (N:22)

(4) Global rating of family (N:24)

(5) Global rating of index child in interview (N:24)

(6) Global rating of siblings (N:18)

None of the foregoing yielded significant findings.

D. Do children ask father questions. Yes vs. no responses were cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:12)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:13)

(3) ITPA composite scores (N:12)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:13)

(5) Global rating of family (N:13)

(6) Global rating of siblings (N:11)

The first four comparisons yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (5) resulted in a trend ($p < .20 > .10$): families rated high in cognitive style tended to be those in which the children indicated that they asked the father questions.

Comparison (6) also yielded a trend ($p < .20 > .10$): siblings rated high in cognitive style tended to come from families in which the children indicated that they asked the father questions.

E. What kinds of questions do children ask. As in Form I analysis, responses were split into a three-fold classification: those pertaining to play or recreation; those which pertain to immediately useful information; and those which are information-seeking primarily in academic areas (2 x 3 analyses were performed). These were compared with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:15)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:16)

(3) ITPA composite scores (N:14)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:16)

(5) Global rating of family (N:16)

(6) Global rating of siblings (N:12)

None of the foregoing yielded significant findings.

F. Does it both mother if children talk when she's working around the house--children's assessment. Yes responses vs. no responses were cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:25)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:27)

(3) ITPA composite scores (N:25)

(4) Global rating of family (N:27)

(5) Global rating of index child in interview (N:27)

(6) Global rating of siblings (N:21)

All but comparisons (2) and (5) yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (2) yielded a trend ($p < .20 > .10$): mothers whose children said were bothered tended to have index children who achieved the greatest gains on the PPVT criterion.

Comparison (5) also yielded a trend ($p < .20 > .10$): mothers whose children said they were not bothered tended to have index children who were rated higher in cognitive style.

G. Does it bother mother if children talk when she's shopping--children's assessment. Yes vs. no responses were cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:25)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:27)

(3) ITPA composite scores (N:25)

(4) Global rating of family (N:27)

(5) Global rating of index child in interview (N:27)

(6) Global rating of siblings (N:22)

All of the foregoing yielded nonsignificant findings.

X. Availability of Reading Material and Encouragement of Reading. This area was tapped by three items: does anyone tell stories to the children; what kinds of books does the index child read; and does anyone ever read to the children.

A. Does anyone tell stories to the children. Yes vs. no responses were cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:27)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:29)

(3) ITPA composite scores (N:27)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:29)

(5) Global rating of family (N:29)

(6) Global rating of siblings (N:23)

None of the foregoing yielded significant findings.

B. What kinds of books does the index child read. The dichotomy, reads books other than school books vs. does not read or reads comic books only, was cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:17)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:18)

(3) ITPA composite scores (N:17)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:18)

(5) MCPS Maturity scale (N:16)

All but comparison (3) yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (3) yielded a highly significant finding ($p < .02$): index children who read books other than school books scored higher on the ITPA.

C. Does anyone ever read to the children. Combined no vs. combined yes responses were cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:28)
(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:30)
(3) ITPA composite scores (N:28)
(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:30)
(5) Global rating of family (N:30)
(6) Global rating of siblings (N:24)

The foregoing comparisons all yielded nonsignificant findings.

XI. Parents' Knowledge of Activities and Whereabouts of Children. For this item, only knowledge of index child's school activities (two different sets of cut-offs) was the focus.

A. Mother very familiar vs. unfamiliar with the index child's school activities was run against the following:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:13)
(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:14)

Comparison (2) yielded a trend ($p < .20 > .10$): mothers who were very familiar with the index child's school activities tended to produce more lows on the PPVT criterion.

B. Mothers very or somewhat familiar vs. unfamiliar with the index child's school activities (larger group) was cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:24)
(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:25)
(3) ITPA composite scores (N:24)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:25)

All of the foregoing but comparison (1) yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (1) yielded a trend ($p < .10 > .05$): mothers who were very, or somewhat familiar with the index child's school activities tended to produce more highs on the Binet criterion.

XII. Role Assignment and Stability of Roles in the Family.

A. Do children have stable role assignments. Stable vs. unstable or sometimes unstable role assignments was run against:

(1) Global rating of family (N:25)

(2) Global rating of index child in interview (N:25)

(3) Global rating of siblings (N:21)

(4) High-Low PPVT status (N:25)

(5) High-Low Binet status (N:24)

None of the above comparisons yielded significant findings.

B. Why does mother feel that family members should be responsible for doing different things around the house. This item was dichotomized into those responses that stressed learning and training vs. those that did not. This was compared with:

(1) High-Low Binet status (N:25)

(2) High-Low PPVT status (N:27)

(3) Global rating of family (N:27)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:27)

None of the above comparisons yielded significant findings.

XIII. Family Members' Perceptions of Each Other. Items in this area include some with affective content. New (Form II) items are also included.

A. *How do children know when their mother is angry?* This item was dichotomized into indications of direct punitiveness on the part of the mother vs. only verbal expressions of anger. This was run against:

(1) High-Low PPVT status (*N*:19)
(2) High-Low Binet status (*N*:18)
(3) ITPA composite scores (*N*:17)
(4) Global rating of index child in interview (*N*:19)
(5) Global rating of siblings (*N*:15)
(6) Global rating of family (*N*:19)

None of the above comparisons yielded significant findings.

B. *Do the children remember anything they did that their mother was proud of.* The cut-off for this item was responses that alluded to school achievement vs. those that did not. This was run against:

(1) High-Low PPVT status (*N*:23)
(2) High-Low Binet status (*N*:23)
(3) ITPA composite scores (*N*:22)
(4) Global rating of index child in interview (*N*:23)

None of the above comparisons resulted in significant findings.

C. *Are your children alike or different?* The split, families in which the mother said their children are alike vs. those families in which the mother said their children are different, was cross-tabulated with:

(1) High-Low PPVT status (*N*:26)
(2) High-Low Binet status (*N*:24)
(3) MCPS Aggressivity scale (*N*:18)
(4) MCPS Hyperactivity scale (*N*:26)
(5) MCPS Maturity scale (*N*:24)

(6) MCPS Inhibition scale (*N*:26)
(7) MCPS Conformity scale (*N*:26)
(8) Global rating of index child in interview (*N*:26)
(9) Global rating of siblings (*N*:21)
(10) Global rating of family (*N*:26)

All but comparison (7) yielded nonsignificant findings.

Comparison (7) yielded a trend ($p < .20 > .10$): mothers who said their children are different tended to have index children rated higher on the MCPS Conformity scale.

D. *How do your children differ?* This item was split according to the conceptual ability displayed by the mother in responding to the question rather than according to the content of the responses themselves. The dichotomy was: mother displays conceptual skills vs. mother does not display conceptual skill. This was run against:

(1) High-Low PPVT status (*N*:28)
(2) High-Low Binet status (*N*:26)
(3) ITPA composite scores (*N*:26)
(4) Rating of abstractness, elaboration, and clarity (*N*:28)

The above comparisons did not yield significant findings.

E. *What do you think is the most important thing your children should learn in school?* Two separate dichotomies were run: responses mentioning reading only vs. those mentioning appropriate behavior only; in the second analysis, responses mentioning reading along with other school work vs. responses mentioning appropriate behavior only were run.

Reading only versus appropriate behavior only was run against:

(1) High-Low PPVT status (*N*:16)
(2) High-Low Binet status (*N*:16)

(3) ITPA composite scores (N:15)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:16)

Reading and other school work versus appropriate behavior only was run against:

(1) High-Low PPVT status (N:15)

(2) High-Low Binet status (N:14)

(3) ITPA composite scores (N:13)

(4) Global rating of index child in interview (N:15)

None of the foregoing eight comparisons yielded significant findings.

Chapter 8

Overview and Conclusions

The present chapter summarizes the major contributions and findings of the investigation described in the preceding pages. For an overview of the achievements of both years, the reader is referred to Appendix A and to Chapter 1. From this material, it can be seen that we attempted to identify and to characterize certain subsamples in our pupil population (participants in an enriched educational program for disadvantaged ghetto children in several Harlem public schools)--those who were felt to profit from a compensatory program and those who did not--in terms of various psychosocial parameters. As noted previously, the overall hypothesis of this research relates to the possibility that family "systems" and "milieus"--viewed in terms of how family members communicate with, and send "messages" to one another (their characteristic communicational style)--may provide various kinds of perspectives and "rules of behavior" that become internalized by its school-going members. We hypothesized further that these perspectives mediate (enhance, curtail) the children's abilities to listen, attend, conceptualize, sit still, etc.--abilities which are crucial to learning situations, be they formal or informal.

That conceptual "styles" influence a child's performance at school has been suggested, even demonstrated, by several authors (e.g., Cohen, 1968). This author concluded "...that conceptual styles may be more critical determinations of pupils' ability to relate to school requirements than are other factors usually associated with class and race discrimination" (p. 202). The reader is referred to Chapter 2 of the current report for additional relevant material reported in the literature. Attention should also be called to the work of Hess (1970) and to that of Minuchin et al. (1967); these authors described in considerable detail the different types of cognitive styles and strategies that families, especially the mothers in these families, demonstrate, and how these might be and indeed are transmitted to their children.

To achieve our purposes, during the first year we developed and worked with a complex family interview technique which was cross-validated with a similar population the second year. We developed and tested reliable rating scales for use in both years's interviews--such scales were designed to assess the behaviors which our interview method was designed to elicit. In the first year, we developed behavioral sessions also designed to allow relevant behaviors to emerge, which permitted further independent, reliable ratings of the index children. In the second year, we tested the new index population with the MCPS and the ITPA--additional steps designed to find out more about the variables associated with the "high" or "low" achievement status of our subjects.

Appendix A demonstrated that the reliability of the ratings in the cognitive style sessions was high but that our expectations that there would be a positive correlation between "high" and "low" status as defined by the two longitudinal criteria and cognitive style ratings based on behavior in the cognitive style sessions were not borne out.

The rest of the current chapter summarizes some of the specific findings in connection with hypothesis testing for both years. We should note at the outset that some of our major objectives, as outlined in Chapter 1, have been achieved. Thus, one of our objectives was to offer the professional community some techniques for assessment and prediction that are highly appropriate for disadvantaged, urban children, specifically: an instrument of family assessment and a set of rating scales for language and communicational styles; further, we were most anxious to explore, and to offer normative evidence for, techniques or a technique for measuring self-concept, appropriate for the current population. We think we have succeeded in doing so with regard to the Missouri Children's Picture Series. In addition, our exploration of the relationship of the ITPA composite score to many of our variables might be helpful to future researchers, in their search for appropriate, reliable verbal and language measures for which there is some validity evidence for this particular population. Also to be noted is our work in the development of the behavioral sessions for the assessment of cognitive style, which, even if not yielding positive findings in these first attempts to explore their efficacy, might nevertheless contain some useful possibilities for methodological innovation in this and similar populations in the investigation of cognitive styles and strategies.

Basic Hypotheses of Study

Our basic hypotheses with regard to the relationship of ratings of various language, cognitive, and communicational processes based on the family's behavior during the interview to high-low status or to very high or very low status as defined by change scores for the Binet and Gates-McGinities measures were not borne out for the Year 1 study. In the second year's study, again there were no significant findings based on the change criteria (for Binet and PPVT high-low status).
$.10 > p > .05$
However, there were two rather strong trends (both $p < .10 > .05$): ratings based on the family's mode of communication bear a strong and positive relationship to high-low Binet change status as defined by the upper and

lower 40th percentiles on the Binet discrepancy score distribution; and the global ratings of the cognitive style of the siblings in the interview also bear a strong and positive relationship to the PPVT extreme (very high--very low) criterion, defined by the upper and lower 30th percentiles of the PPVT change scores distribution.

It is thus seen that although our expectations were not confirmed, that is, ratings based on family behavior were not significantly associated with high-low criteria of change for index children, some promising suggestions are present that our basic hypotheses might be valid. The ratings are sufficiently reliable as are other variables in this study to permit continued exploration of factors associated with the status of the index children. The subsequent sections summarize the significant findings based on such exploration.

Significant Findings

Tables 15 and 17 present significant findings for Forms I and II respectively, while Tables 16 and 18 summarize "trends" as determined by a relatively low level of confidence $.20 > p > .10$ ($p < .20 > .10$). The content of Tables 16 and 18 will not be discussed below. A glance at the findings presented in the previous chapter will indicate the extent and substance of the insignificant findings. Below is a brief recapitulation of major significant findings.

(1) Public School attended was significantly associated with Gates-McGinitie change scores (high-low status), a finding which may reflect school policy or the particular set of teachers and/or curriculum elements within a particular school at a particular point in time. This finding was not substantiated for Form II, in that there was only a trend (for a different school) to produce children with greater gains on

the PPVT. Apparently, each year, different schools may obtain pre-eminence in terms of specific and changing criteria. The particular set of variables associated with such differences has not yet been determined, but is sufficiently interesting to merit further exploration.

(2) Age the mother left south also turned out to be significantly related to one of the criteria in Form I, but in a direction not immediately explainable. Mothers staying longer in the south bore index children higher on initial Binet scores. Since in Year I the last grade mother completed was significantly and positively related to global ratings of siblings and since also there is a trend in the same direction for last grade also to be related to global family ratings, it is possible that mothers who stayed longer in the south were able to complete more education, perhaps thus producing children with higher scores. As a matter of fact, although significant findings were not obtained in this regard, for both years, a strong trend prevailed for mothers who remained longer in the south to achieve more schooling.

In Form II, age the mother left the south is not related to any of the criterion measures. However, certain trends appear for the last grade mother completed, but one of these is in an unexpected direction. Last grade mother completed is positively related to ITPA composite score (trend) but inversely related to global rating of index child (trend) in that mothers with less schooling have index children rated higher in cognitive style. Obviously, mother's education and age she left the south bear complex relationships to the criterion measures.

(3) The mother's response to being asked questions and the children's assessment of whether the mother likes to be asked questions yielded several interesting and significant findings for Form I. The mother's

affirmative response to whether she likes to be asked questions was significantly and positively associated with global ratings of the index child in the interview and high-low Gates status; a trend in the same direction was found for the mothers who liked being asked questions to come from families with higher global ratings. Similarly, children's affirmative response to this question concerning the mother was positively and significantly related to gains the index child made on the Gates. There is also a trend for index children who receive higher ratings to come from families in which the children say the mother likes being asked questions.

On the other hand, a seemingly contradictory trend was found: when the children indicated it bothered their mother if they talked while she is working around the house, their mothers tended to receive higher global ratings. Such mothers may well be more differentiated and goal-oriented, it is suggested, than mothers who "flexibly" allow their children to interrupt them as they work.

Interestingly, none of the foregoing comparisons yielded even trends when the corresponding Form II data were analyzed.

Several additional trends (some of them contradictory or unexpected) emerged, suggesting that chance factors (and/or unreliability of ratings) may well have been at work. For example, comparisons involving the crowdedness index yielded the following trends $.10 > p > .05$ ($\underline{p} < .10 > .05$): less crowded housing conditions were associated with higher ratings of the index child in the interview but with lower ratings of the index child in the behavioral sessions (for one rater only). Another trend $.05 < p < .10$ ($\underline{p} < .10 > .05$) in an unexpected direction suggested that more frequent school absences of the index child were associated with greater gains on the Binet.

When Form II results are examined (see Table 17), many more significant findings emerged than was the case for Form I. This may have resulted from comparisons involving the ITPA and the MCPS, which were not employed in Year 1.

(1) MCPS Conformity in this population seems to produce some interesting relationships, possibly relevant only to the present sample--a statement easily explored with other populations. There was, for example, a significant positive relationship between MCPS Conformity and the global rating of cognitive style of the index child (in the interview situation). Further, a trend $.05 < p < .10$ ($p < .10 > .05$) in the same direction was found for children scoring higher in MCPS Conformity to come from families rated higher in mode of communication in the interview setting.

(2) MCPS Aggressivity was found to bear a significant negative relationship to the global rating of the index child in the interview. That children higher in global ratings in the interview were more conforming (see above) and less aggressive (at least in terms of MCPS scores) is a completely consistent finding; but again we must suggest the possibility that these relationships may be unique to the current population--an easily tested assumption.

(3) ITPA composite score showed a significant, positive relationship to High-low Binet status (gains). Further, a trend $.10 > p > .05$ ($p < .10 >$ 5) was found in that index children with higher ITPA scores tended to come from families in which the siblings were rated higher in cognitive style in the interview. An additional significant finding once more falls in the expected direction: index children who read books other than school books score higher on the ITPA than the other children. Finally, a

$.10 > p > .05$

trend already discussed ($p < .10 > .05$) is in the same direction: the last grade mother completed and the ITPA composite score of the index child are positively associated.

It would thus seem that the ITPA measure reliably reflects the kinds of verbal and conceptual variables about which some of our hypotheses revolve.

(4) Sex of the index child bears an unexpected significant relationship to one of the criterion measures in that males score higher than females on initial PPVT scores--a finding that may reflect important (but unaccounted for) sample differences early in the program.

(5) Number of persons present at the interview bears an interesting inverse relationship to some of the ratings made at the interview: a significant finding was that fewer numbers of persons at the interview are associated with higher global ratings of the family. A trend

$.10 > p > .05$

($p < .10 > .05$) in the same direction was found for higher global ratings of the index child in the interview and fewer numbers of persons present at the interview to be associated. Since number of persons present at the interview and number of permanent household residents are significantly and positively related, we have here a direct indication that with increases of size of family there are likely to be decreases of level of rating in terms of communicational and cognitive processes. Before any conclusion can be drawn from such findings--for example, that smallness of family tends to be associated with higher cognitive levels--the sheer physical fact of larger groups generating higher noise levels and more confused communication processes simply because of numbers of component parts qua parts rather than because of more complex psychological concomitants, should be considered. This, of course, is a rather straightforward experimental and empirical task that can be easily explored.

(6) An expected positive relationship was found for affirmative responses to the question--does index child talk to adults--to be significantly associated with higher global ratings of the index child in the interview.

(7) Another expected positive relationship was found for ratings of stability of eating arrangements to be significantly associated with greater gains on the Binet criterion (high-low status of index child).

(8) An additional trend ($p < .10 > .05$) indicated that the mother's knowledge of the index child's school activities is associated with greater gains on the Binet criterion (high-low status of index child).

The general "spirit" of much of the foregoing, despite failures of our basic hypotheses (interview ratings vs. high-low status of index children) to be confirmed, is that more differentiated, smaller, knowledgeable, and stable families, in terms of more conforming and less aggressive index children, stable eating arrangements, even mother's wish to work around the house without being interrupted, are associated with higher level cognitive and communicational ratings. In addition, children who talk to adults, or mothers who liked being asked questions, or children who indicate their mothers like being asked questions all come from families in which there are either higher ratings or in which there are gains on a high-low criterion. But mothers who do not wish to be interrupted when they work around the house (children's assessment--Form I trend only) also tend to receive higher global ratings--a seeming contradiction, which is not, after all, so unexpected in that such mothers are probably more differentiated and less diffuse and "fluid" in overall behavior and goal-orientation.

Some evidence for these general conclusions is reported in the literature. For example, that stability and structure in family styles is positively related to analytic, as opposed to relational response styles, and that the analytic style is related to high achievement, has been suggested by Cohen (1968), on the basis of empirical evidence. We have already alluded to the work of Minuchin et al. (1967) pointing along the same lines. Also, Powell (1968), reported that low achievers among first-grade pupils of low socioeconomic status tended to come from families in which there were more than two siblings in the home. (That disadvantaged children performed better when there were no more than two siblings at home was one of several significant findings--based on matched groups--that this author reported. His findings were all relevant and appropriate to our own expectations, for example: reading achievement is significantly related to the presence of a newspaper in the home, and disadvantaged children who achieve in reading are judged by their teachers as being able to concentrate better than those of comparable abilities who performed poorly.)

Future Research Plans--The Family Interview

It is possible for us to further explore--using greater depth of investigation--various aspects of the interview we have developed. This is made possible because of additional funding from another agency, in the light of the achievements already made within the past two years.[5]

Combining Samples. The new (current) research permits an exploration of the relationship between aspects of the family as disclosed in the interview and various criterion groups not hitherto possible to execute because of small sample size. That is, we are now able to combine both years' samples--working with extremes (very high or very low) on various criteria, or with items whose distributions did not permit statistical exploration in each year's analysis held separately.

---

[5] Additional funds have been made available to us by the Office of Child Development for an exploration entitled, "Development of Predictive Indices for Achievement of Children in an Experimental Intervention Program in Harlem: Extended Analyses of Cognitive, Familial, Personality, and Social-Behavioral Data from Two Ongoing Research Investigations," OCD-CB-07.

Thus, a careful discussion of item distributions, especially for items which could not be run because of distribution problems, or which although run separately for each year, yielded possibilities for significant findings were a larger sample to be explored, resulted in a lengthy list of interview items to be run against all family ratings, high-low status on the various standardized tests (i.e., Binet) as well as additional available data not incorporated into the currently reported design such as the Metropolitan Achievement Test Reading Vocabulary Score or the California Mental Maturity Scale. Among the items to be run (against criteria noted above as well as various ratings) are:

(1) Does father live in the home
(2) How long has it been since he (father) lived there (if not)
(3) Household rating: condition of house interior
(4) Crowdedness rating
(5) Age mother left birthplace
(6) Is mother working
(7) Index child's absence from school
(8) Consistency between mother's and children's aspirations for child (for children 10 years of age and older excluding index child)
(9) Accuracy or appropriateness of mother's estimate of schooling necessary for aspirations for all children (including index child)
(10) Location of mother's schooling
(11) Last grade mother completed
(12) Mother's membership in clubs
(13) Membership in clubs for index child and siblings older than index child
(14) How frequently does mother vote
(15) Rating of stability of family's eating arrangements
(16) Does family have conversations during meals

(17) Do children ask mother a lot of questions
(18) Do children ask father a lot of questions
(19) Does mother like to be asked questions (children's assessment)
(20) Does mother like to be asked questions (mother's assessment)
(21) If yes (above), why (learning vs. non-learning oriented response)
(22) Do children think it bothers mother if they talk when she's shopping
(23) What kinds of books does index child read
(24) Does anyone in family ever read to the children
(25) Extent of mother's knowledge of children's friends
(26) Does anyone ever tell stories to children
(27) Mother's recollection of index child's activities
(28) Mother's recollection of school-age siblings' activities
(29) Does mother ask children 14 years of age and over to be home at any particular time in the evening
(30) Why mother feels that family members should have responsibilities around the house (conceptual vs. non-conceptual responses)
(31) The stability of children's role assignments
(32) Does index child remember anything that mother was proud of
(33) If yes (above), how did index child know she was proud (verbal vs. physical display of approval)
(34) What does mother do when children have done something she approves of (verbal vs. nonverbal orientation)
(35) How do children usually know when mother is angry (verbal responses vs. threatening responses, vs. physical display)
(36) What are mother's feelings when she has to punish her children (conceptual response implying differentiation of emotions vs. non-conceptual response with non-differentiation of emotions)

The above, note, falls into various areas of our interview data, such as: demographic, employment patterns, educational aspirations, crowdedness and housing, community participation, and various interactive aspects of family living including the availability of adults for verbal interchange, availability of reading material and encouragement of reading, encouragement of verbal interchange with adults, role assignments and stability of roles, and various attempts to assess the conceptual level and style of family members.

Construction of indices. Various items have additional potential for being combined with each other in such ways as to shed further light, hopefully, on variables in which we are interested. Thus, we plan to construct scores for various family members or the family group as a whole based on responses to more than one item in the interview. This includes the development of indices such as the following:

(1) Mother's activity level: does mother vote? does mother participate in groups or clubs? Mother's employment status will also be considered when scoring for this index, since this might bear an interactional relationship with her activity level.

(2) Mother's verbal vs. nonverbal orientation: this index could be derived from some of the children's responses to such questions as how do the children know when their mother is proud or how do the children know when their mother is angry?

(3) Family interaction--stability index: this could reflect the stability of various interactive processes and activities in the family and could be based on items or ratings such as the stability of eating arrangements and role assignments.

(4) Consistency index of mother's and children's assessment of certain situations. This index, for example, could reflect consistency of responses to items such as whether the mother likes to be asked questions (mother's assessment) and whether the children also think that the mother likes to be asked questions.

(5) Index of mother's conceptual level and style: this index can be based on several ratings of mother's responses to questions such as why mother likes to be asked questions, why mother feels the children should have responsibilities, and mother's feelings when she has to punish her children.

The above indices, together with others, can be compared, once again, to various criterion measures and ratings in search for more detailed examination of our hypotheses.

Intra-item comparisons. The current explorations will also permit work not previously undertaken because of time and because its scope was not within the design of the study. It is now possible to relate many of the items and the standard test scores to each other in order to explore further our sample and interview characteristics. Thus, the ITPA and the MCPS can now be related to many additional interview items. Further, the mother's education could be examined in terms of size of family, educational and occupational aspirations for index child, and mother's participation in groups and clubs, etc. Also, the mother's employment can be related to participation in groups and clubs, mother's knowledge of index child's activities, index child's absence from school, and whether or not index child is read to or listened to. The father's presence in the household could also be related to many items not yet examined; and the size of the family unit similarly could be related to many additional items. These are examples of work planned, and does not contain the completed list. Obviously, even though the foregoing is outside the scope of the current study, the possibility of finding provocative relationships exists.

Final Comment

One specific interesting aspect of our findings concerns the ITPA which we feel is particularly useful with our population. Additional future work might be based on further accumulation of MCPS norms and comparison of such norms with other socioeconomic groups. For example, the current findings in connection with the positive association of MCPS conformity and negative association of MCPS aggressivity to some of the ratings of communicational style based on family interview behavior might not hold true for other types of family populations.

We would very much like to encourage further use of our interview techniques and rating scales in other settings, and possibly for other experimental purposes. We specifically recommend further exploration of our hypotheses concerning style and strategies of families as systems in this and other populations of different socioeconomic levels to see whether or not our general findings concerning the relationship of family stability, structure, and order to cognitive and communicational style holds.

Overall, and in sum, we feel that we have met our objectives for the two-year funded research investigation described in the current report. We have explored our hypotheses and have developed some interesting research methods and tools, such as the family interview. Since one of our major long range objectives was also concerned with the eventual possibility of being able to predict the future academic status of such children as are represented by our sample in terms of different family, communicational, language, and standardized test variables, and since we have already begun such a program, we feel that these funded projects have been both useful and important.

References

Baker, E. A. An actual study of maturity level in young boys. Paper presented at meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Philadelphia, 1969.

Barrett, H. O. An intensive study of 32 gifted children. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1957, 36, 192-195.

Bateman, B. *The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities in current research: summaries of studies.* Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1965.

Bayley, N., & Schaefer, E. S. Correlations of maternal and child behaviors with the development of mental abilities. *Monograph of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 1964, 29, 97.

Beller, E. K. The evaluation of effects of early educational intervention on intellectual and social development of disadvantaged children. Unpublished manuscript, Temple University Research Center, 1968.

Bennett, V. D. C. Development of a self concept Q sort for use with elementary age school children. *Journal of School Psychology*, 1964, 3, 19-25.

Bhatnagar, K. P. Academic achievement as a function of one's self-concepts and ego-functions. *Education and Psychology Review*, 1966, 6, 178-182.

Blatt, B., & Garfunkel, F. Educational intelligence: determinants of school behavior of disadvantaged children. *Exceptional Children*, 1967, 33, 601-608.

Blau, Z. S. Negro-white mobility, maternal practices, and school achievement. Described in Institute for Juvenile Research, *Research Bulletin*, 1968, 4, No. 2.

Bledsoe, J. C. Self concepts of children and their intelligence, achievement, interests and anxiety. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 1964, 20, 55-58.

Brown, J. R. An exploratory study of change in self concept. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1968, 28(10-A), 3990-3991.

Bruck, M., & Bodwin, R. F. The relationship between self-concept and the presence and absence of scholastic achievement. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1962, 18, 181-182.

Bruck, M., & Bodwin, R. F. Age differences between SCS-DAP test results and GPA. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1963, 19, 315-316.

Capobianco, R. J. A pilot project for culturally disadvantaged preschool children. *Journal of Special Education*, 1967, 1, 191-196.

Christopher, S. A. Perceived strength of interpersonal relationships and parental value orientation factors as related to academic achievement. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1966, 27(3-A), 666.

Cohen, J. Weighted kappa: nominal scale agreement with provision for scales disagreement or partial credit. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1968, 70, 213-220.

Cohen, R. The relation between socio-conceptual styles and orientation to school requirements. *Sociology of Education*, 1968, 41, 201-220.

Crescimbeni, J. Broken homes affect academic achievement. *Education*, 1964, 84, 437-431.

Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1955, 52, 281-302.

Crosswait, A. B., Jr. A study of selected cognitive and affective variables functioning in two sub-groups of lower economic class fifth and sixth grade pupils in a non-metropolitan area. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1967, 27(9-A), 2721-2722.

Crowne, D. P., & Stephens, M. W. Self-acceptance and self-evaluation behavior: a critique of methodology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1961, 58, 104-121.

Davidson, H. H., & Greenberg, J. W. *School achievers from a deprived background*. New York: City College of the City University of New York, 1967.

Davidson, H. H., & Lang, G. Children's perception of their teachers' feelings toward them related to self-perception, school achievement, and behavior. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 1960, 29, 107-118.

Deutsch, C., & Silfen, C. Effects of a longitudinal enrichment program on language skills of disadvantaged children. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Santa Monica, March, 1969.

Deutsch, M., & Victor, J. An evaluation of the effectiveness of an enriched curriculum in overcoming the consequences of environments. Final Report to the Office of Education, Contract # OE-5-10-045, 1971.

Douglas, J. W. B., & Ross, J. M. The later educational progress and emotional adjustment of children who went to nursery schools or classes. *Educational Research*, 1964, 7, 73-80.

Fennimore, F. The effect of the self-concept on reading achievement in a college reading clinic. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1966, 27(6-A), 1954.

Fink, M. B. Self concept as it relates to academic underachievement. *California Journal of Educational Research*, 1962, 13, 57-62.

Gill, N. T., Herdtner, T. M., & Lough, L. Perceptual and socioeconomic variables, instruction in body orientation, and predicted academic success in young children. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1968, 26, 1175-1184.

Gilliland, B. E. Small group counseling with Negro adolescents in a public high school. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1968, 15, 147-152.

Goldstein, K. M., & Chorost, S. B. Preschool and background factors in school adjustment of culturally disadvantaged children. Proceedings of the 74th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1966, 275-276.

Gustav, A. Comparison of college grades and self-concept. *Psychological Reports*, 1962, 11, 601-602.

Hess, R. D. The transmission of cognitive strategies in poor families: the socialization of apathy and underachievement. In V. L. Allen (Ed.), *Psychological factors in poverty*. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1970.

Hughes, T. M. A study of the relationship of coping strength to self-concept, school achievement, and general anxiety level in sixth grade pupils. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1968, 28(10-A), 4001.

Irvin, F. S. Sentence completion responses and scholastic success or failure. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1967, 14, 269-271.

Kerensky, V. M. Reported self-concept in relation to academic achievement in secondary school. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1967, 27(8-A), 2325.

Kirk, S. A., McCarthy, J. J., & Kirk, W. D. *The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities: examiner's manual*. (Rev. ed.) Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1968.

L'Abate, L., & Hosford, P. M. Screening children with learning disabilities. Paper read at the Invitational Conference on Measurement in Education, Atlanta, October, 1967.

Lahaderne, H. M. Attitudinal and intellectual correlates of attention: a study of four sixth-grade classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1968, 59, 320-324.

Lamy, M. M. Relationship of self-perception of primary children to achievement in reading. In I. J. Gordon (Ed.), *Human development: readings in research.* Chicago: Scott Foresman, 1965.

Larson, R. G., & Olson, J. L. Compensatory education: how much is enough? *Journal of Negro Education*, 1968, 37, 164-167.

Legge, W. B. Comparisons of listening abilities of intermediate grade pupils categorized according to intelligence, achievement, and sex. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1967, 27(9-A), 2947-2948.

Levine, M., Wesolowski, J., & Corbett, F. Pupil turnover and academic performance in an inner city elementary school. Psychology in the Schools, 1966, 3, 153-158.

Lourenso, S. V., Greenberg, J. W., & Davidson, H. H. Personality characteristics revealed in drawings of deprived children who differ in school achievement. Journal of Educational Research, 1965, 59, 63-67.

Mackie, J. B., Maxwell, A., & Rafferty, F. T. Psychological development of culturally disadvantaged Negro kindergarten children: a study of the selective influence of family and school variables. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1967, 37, 367-368.

McCarthy, J. J., & Kirk, S. A. The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities: examiner's manual. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1961.

McCarthy, J. J., & Kirk, S. A. The construction, standardization and statistical characteristics of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1963.

McDaniel, E. A. Relationships between self-concept and specific variables in a low-income culturally different population. Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 28(10-A), 4005.

McGlathery, G. E. An assessment of science achievement of five- and six-year old students of contrasting socio-economic backgrounds. Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 28(10-A), 3897.

Medinnus, G. R. Q-sort descriptions of five-year-old children by their parents. Child Development, 1961, 32, 473-489.

Minuchin, S., Montalvo, B., Guerney, B. G. Jr., Rosman, B. L., & Schumer, F. Families of the slums: an exploration of their structure and treatment. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967.

Mulliken, R. K. A study of parental attitudes: self-concepts and personality characteristics of deviant achievers of average ability. Dissertation Abstracts, 1966, 27(4-A), 961-962.

Mulroy, I. The relationship between anxiety and scholastic success in junior high school children. Papers in Psychology, 1968, 59, 362-369.

Nunnally, J. C. Tests and measurements: assessment and prediction. New York: McGraw Hill, 1959.

O'Hara, R. P. Vocational self-concept and high school achievement. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1966, 15, 106-112.

Osgood, C. E. A behavioristic analysis. In Contemporary approaches to cognition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957. (a)

Osgood, C. E. Motivational dynamics of language behavior. In Nebraska symposium on motivation. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1957. (b)

Owen, D. R. Heritability of personality in children. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Missouri, 1968.

Payne, D. A. & Farquhar, W. W. The dimensions of an objective measure of academic self-concept. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1962, 53, 187-192.

Peppin, B. H. Parental understanding, parental acceptance, and the self concept of children as a function of academic over- and under-achievement. Dissertation Abstracts, 1963, 23, 4422-4423.

Pitts, V. L. An investigation of the relationships between two preschool programs on the adjustment and readiness of disadvantaged pupils. Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 28(11-A), 4389-4390.

Powell, D. A. A comparison of some environmental factors and characteristics of high-achievers and average-achievers in reading among first-grade pupils of low socio-economic status. Unpublished dissertation, University of New York at Buffalo, 1968.

Quimby, V. Differences in the self-ideal relationship of an achieved group and an underachieved group. California Journal of Educational Research, 1967, 18, 23-31.

Rogers, C. R., & Dymond, R. F. (Eds.) Psychotherapy and personality change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Schwartz, S., Deutsch, C. P., & Weissman, A. Language development in two groups of socially disadvantaged young children. Psychological Reports, 1967, 21, 169-178.

Seidel, H. E., Jr., Barkley, M. L., & Smith, D. Evaluation of a program for Project Head Start. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1967, 110, 185-197.

Sewell, W. H., & Shah, V. P. Parents' education and children's educational aspirations and achievements. American Sociological Review, 1968, 33, 191-209.

Shaw, M. C. Note on parent attitudes toward independence training and the academic achievement of their children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1964, 55, 371-374.

Shaw, M. C., & Alves, G. J. The self-concept of bright academic underachievers: II. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, 42, 401-403.

Shaw, M. C., Edson, K., & Bell, H. M. The self-concept of bright underachieving high school students as revealed by an adjective checklist. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1960, 39, 193-196.

Sines, J. O., Pauker, J. D., & Sines, L. K. The Missouri Children's Picture Series. Unpublished test, University of Missouri Medical Center, 1967.

Sines, J. O., Pauker, J. D., & Sines, L. K. The Missouri Children's Picture Series: an objective, non-verbal personality test for children. Progress Report, University of Missouri Medical Center, 1968.

Sines, J. O., Pauker, J. K., Sines, L. K., & Owen, D. R. Identification of clinically relevant dimensions of children's behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 3, 728-734.

Southworth, R. S. A study of the effects of short term group counseling on underachieving sixth grade students. Dissertation Abstracts, 1966, 27(5-A), 1272.

Stephenson, W. The study of behavior Q-techniques and its methodology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Stillwell, L. J. An investigation of the interrelationships among global self concept, role self concept and achievement. Dissertation Abstracts, 1966, 27(3-A), 682.

Taylor, R. G. Personality traits and discrepant achievement: a review. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 76-81.

Teigland, J. J., Winkler, R. C., Munger, P. F., & Kranzler, G. D. Some concomitants of underachievement at the elementary school level. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44 950-955.

Tuel, J. K., & Wursten, R. The influence of intra-personal variables on academic achievement. California Journal of Educational Research, 1965, 16, 58-64.

Vosk, J. S. Study of Negro children with learning difficulties at the outset of their school careers. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1966, 36, 32-40.

Wagman, M. University achievement and daydreaming behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 196-198.

Walker, R. N. A scale for parents' ratings: some ipsative and normative correlations. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1968, 77, 95-133.

Wattenberg, W. W., & Clifford, C. Relation of self-concepts to beginning achievement in reading. Child Development, 1964, 35, 461-467.

Weener, P., Barritt, L. S., & Semmel, M. I. Forum: A critical evaluation of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities. Exceptional Children, 1967, 33, 373-379.

Wittenborn, J. R. Contributions and current status of Q methodology. Psychological Bulletin, 1961, 58, 131-142.

Wyer, R. S., Jr. Behavioral correlates of academic achievement: II. Pursuit of individual versus group goals in a decision-making task. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1968, 59, 74-81.

Zubin, J., Eron, L. D., & Schumer, F. An experimental approach to projective techniques. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Table 1

Sample II: Mean Age and Sex of Fourth Graders (Fall, 1969) who were in the Institute's Program from Prekindergarten or Kindergarten through the Third Grade

Public School	N	Sex	Classification[a]	Mean Age[b]
68	4	M---2 F---2	E	108.25
	3	M---3 F---0	FK	109.00
Total	7			108.57
79	4	M---2 F---2	E	110.50
Total	4			110.50
200	4	M---4 F---0	E	109.25
	3	M---2 F---1	FK	110.67
Total	7			109.86
175	13	M---8 F---5	E	110.77
Total	13			110.77
Total, Schools Combined	25		Es	110.09
	6		FKs	109.83
	31	M---21 F---10		110.03

Note: The ITPA and the MCPS were administered to the total sample of 31 Ss. The Ns used for analyses, however, varied as a function of the treatment of the data. There were 30 families in the interview sample because one family would not consent to an interview.

[a] E designates subjects who entered the IDS program in prekindergarten (1964). FK designates subjects who entered the IDS program in kindergarten (1965).

[b] As of September, 1969; converted into months. Mean age for all Ss is just over 9 years, 2 months.

Table 2

Sample II: Initial Stanford-Binet Mental Age Scores (1966) of High and Low Gainers as determined by Stanford-Binet Change Scores (Spring, 1966--Spring, 1969)

	N	Mean M.A.[a]	S.D.	t	p
High Gainers	15	72.80	8.27	1.03	ns
Low Gainers	11	76.27	8.70		
Very High Gainers	9	73.67	6.24	.66	ns
Very Low Gainers	9	76.22	9.72		

Note: High and Low gainers are defined by the top and bottom 40% of the sample. Very High and Very Low gainers are defined by the top and bottom 30% of the sample.

[a] Converted into months.

Table 3

Sample II: Mean Chronological Age in Months (September, 1969) of High and Low Gainers as determined by Stanford-Binet Change Scores (Spring, 1966--Spring, 1969)

	N	Mean C.A.	S.D.	t	p
High Gainers	15	109.33	3.96	1.11	ns
Low Gainers	11	110.91	2.95		
Very High Gainers	9	108.11	3.69	1.84	ns
Very Low Gainers	9	111.11	3.22		

Note: High and Low gainers are defined by the top and bottom 40% of the sample. Very High and Very Low gainers are defined by the top and bottom 30% of the sample.

Table 4

Sample II: Initial Stanford-Binet Mental Age Scores (1966) of High and Low Gainers as determined by Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Change Scores (Spring, 1966--Spring, 1969)

	N	Mean M.A.	S.D.	t	p
High Gainers	13	71.53	7.95	.39	ns
Low Gainers	11	73.00	10.12		
Very High Gainers	9	72.66	8.57	.74	ns
Very Low Gainers	9	69.77	7.80		

Note: High and Low gainers are defined by the top and bottom 40% of the sample. Very High and Very Low gainers are defined by the top and bottom 30% of the sample.

Table 5

Sample II: Mean Chronological Age (September, 1969) of High and Low Gainers as determined by Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Change Scores (Spring, 1966--Spring, 1969)

	N	Mean	S.D.	t	p
High Gainers	14	109.21	3.57	1.08	ns
Low Gainers	11	110.81	3.78		
Very High Gainers	10	109.30	3.65	.35	ns
Very Low Gainers	9	109.88	3.51		

Note: High and Low gainers are defined by the top and bottom 40% of the sample. Very High and Very Low gainers are defined by the top and bottom 30% of the sample.

Table 6

Sample II: Initial Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Scores (1966) of High and Low Gainers as determined by Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Change Scores (Spring, 1966--Spring, 1969)

	N	Mean	S.D.	t	p
High Gainers	14	55.64	11.61	1.56	ns
Low Gainers	11	62.90	11.49		
Very High Gainers	10	58.60	10.77	.40	ns
Very Low Gainers	9	60.55	9.88		

Note: High and Low gainers are defined by the top and bottom 40% of the sample. Very High and Very Low gainers are defined by the top and bottom 30% of the sample.

Table 7

Sample II: Initial Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Scores (1966) of High and Low Gainers as determined by Stanford-Binet Change Scores (Spring, 1966--Spring, 1969)

	N	Mean	S.D.	t	p
High Gainers	15	67.33	16.44	.69	ns
Low Gainers	12	62.58	18.97		
Very High Gainers	9	65.44	18.08	.53	ns
Very Low Gainers	9	60.77	19.09		

Note: High and Low gainers are defined by the top and bottom 40% of the sample. Very High and Very Low gainers are defined by the top and bottom 30% of the sample.

Table 8

Frequency Distributions by Sex of High and Low Scorers for the Missouri Children's Picture Series and Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability

MCPS Subscales	Male	Female	Total
(1) Conformity			
High	10	5	15
Low	11	5	16
(2) Maturity			
High	11	4	15
Low	10	4	14
(3) Aggressivity			
High	12	4	16
Low	9	2	11
(4) Inhibition			
High	12	5	17
Low	9	5	14
(5) Hyperactivity			
High	11	5	16
Low	10	5	15
ITPA Composite Score			
High	11	2	13
Low	7	5	12

Note: Because all Ss were tested, the N for these instruments is 31, 10 females and 21 males.

Table 9

Frequency Distributions of Ratings for Two Raters on each Scale of Interview (Form I) and Number of Disagreements between Raters

	Rater A (*N*=36)			Rater B (*N*=35)			
Rating Scale	High	Low	Can't Rate	High	Low	Can't Rate	Number of Disagreements[a]
Global Family	24	12	0	23	12	0	4
Global Mother	28	8	0	27	8	0	4
Global Siblings	19	14	3	19	13	3	9
Global Index	23	13	0	24	11	0	6
Mode of Communication	29	7	0	24	9	2	4
Listening and Attentional Skills	25	11	0	23	11	1	8
Responses to, and Awareness of Listener	16	5	15	18	5	12	3
Task Furtherance and Completion	23	13	0	22	12	1	7
Transitions and Sequencing	27	8	1	22	8	5	8
Conceptual Level	25	11	0	22	12	1	7
Content Aspects of Communication	26	7	3	19	5	11	4
Introspectiveness	19	17	0	21	11	3	8
Generality of Responses	22	3	11	12	6	17	2
Mother's Role in Maintaining Rules of Effective Communication	21	14	1	26	7	2	8

[a] These disagreements represent disagreements *across* the assumed midpoint of each rating scale and not scale-point disagreements.

Table 10

Frequency Distributions of Ratings for Two Raters on each Scale of Interview (Form II) and Number of Disagreements between Raters

Rating Scale	Rater A ($\underline{N}$=30) High	Rater A ($\underline{N}$=30) Low	Rater A ($\underline{N}$=30) Can't Rate	Rater B ($\underline{N}$=30) High	Rater B ($\underline{N}$=30) Low	Rater B ($\underline{N}$=30) Can't Rate	Number of Disagreements[a]
Global Family	20	10	0	19	11	0	3
Global Mother	26	3	1	25	4	1	5
Global Siblings	14	10	6	14	11	5	2
Global Index	17	13	0	18	12	0	5
Mode of Communication	23	7	0	20	6	4	3
Listening and Attentional Skills	20	10	0	22	8	0	6
Task Furtherance and Completion	17	13	0	21	8	1	9
Transitions and Sequencing	20	4	6	10	0	20	1
Conceptual Level	16	14	0	16	12	2	8
Introspectiveness	17	11	2	24	4	2	10
Mother's Role in Maintaining Rules of Effective Communication	12	11	7	15	6	9	2

---

[a] These disagreements represent disagreements across the assumed midpoint of each rating scale and not scale-point disagreements.

Table 11

Inter-Rater Reliability Coefficients (Expressed as k_w)
based on Interview (Forms I and II) Rating Scales

	Form I (Total N = 35)				Form II (Total N = 30)			
Rating Scale	Number of Can't Rates	N^a	k_w	z	Number of Can't Rates	N^a	k_w	z
Global Family	0	35	.50	3.36***	0	30	.57	4.01***
Global Mother	0	35	.57	4.29***	1	29	.38	2.47**
Global Siblings	3	32	.40	2.80**	6	24	.66	4.26***
Global Index	0	35	.62	4.08***	0	30	.61	4.49***
Mode of Communication	2	33	.40	3.28***	4	26	.54	3.44***
Listening and Attentional Skills	1	34	.40	3.52***	0	30	.51	3.67***
Task Furtherance and Completion	1	34	.41	3.15**	1	29	.39	2.71**
Conceptual Level	1	34	.52	3.75***	2	28	.52	3.59***
Introspectiveness	3	32	.50	4.60***	4	26	.16	1.08^b
Responses to and Awareness of Listener^b	19	16	c					
Content Aspects of Communication^b	13	22	c					
Generality of Responses^b	21	14	c					
Transition and Sequencing	5	30	.32	2.31*	20	10		
Mother's Role	2	33	.31	2.42*	13	17	c	

[a] N upon which weighted kappa was performed. Note that although the total sample N for Form I was 36, data for one family was missing for one rater. Therefore, the total possible N for reliability purposes was 35.

[b] Not significant.

[c] Scale omitted because of disproportionate number of "can't rate" ratings.

*$p < .05$, two-tailed value
**$p < .01$, two-tailed value
***$p < .001$, two-tailed value

Table 12

Relationship of Subscale Ratings to

Global Family Rating Scale[a]

Global Family (Overall Communicational Level) Rating Related to:	Form I			Form II		
	phi	Chi Square[b]	p	phi	Chi Square[c]	p
Mode of Communication	.62	13.85	.001	.53	8.41	.01
Listening and Attentional Skills	.87	27.51	.001	.62	11.72	.001
Task Furtherance and Completion	.87	27.50	.001	.59	10.61	.01
Transitions and Sequencing	.58	11.94	.001	d		
Conceptual Level	.62	13.76	.001	.40	4.84	.05
Introspectiveness	.69	17.07	.001	d		
Mother's Role	.82	23.72	.001	d		

[a] Phi coefficients are based on one observer's ratings.

[b] All analyses based on 36 cases, except for Transitions and Sequencing where $N = 35$.

[c] $N = 30$ for all analyses.

[d] Item eliminated because of inter-rater reliability considerations.

Table 13

Relationship Between High-Low Subject Status Criteria and Interview Rating Scales--Form I

	Criteria							
	High-Low Binet		Very High-Very Low Binet		High-Low Gates		Very High-Very Low Gates	
Rating Scale	N	Chi Square[a]	N	Chi Square[a]	N	Chi Square[a]	N	Chi Square[a]
Global Rating of Family	28	.155	20	.165	23	.019	18	.321
Global Rating of Mother	28	.000	20	.038	23	.123	18	.000
Global Rating of Index Child	28	.155	20	.165	23	.359	18	1.108
Global Rating of Siblings	26	.009	18	.225	20	.208	15	.100
Listening and Attention	28	.000	20	.008	23	.123	18	.000
Task Furtherance	28	.155	20	.165	23	.019	18	.250
Conceptual Level	28	.000	20	.008	20	.359	18	.321
Mode of Communication	28	.000	20	.113	23	.207	18	.000
Transitions and Sequencing	27	.299	19	.604	22	.125	17	.012
Introspectiveness	28	.146	20	.000	23	.365	18	.889
Mother's Role in Maintaining Effective Rules of Communication	27	.046	19	.015	21	.077	17	.041

Note: High and low designations refer to the top and bottom 40th percentile sections of the respective distributions while very high and very low designations refer to the top and bottom 30th percentile sections.

[a] None of these chi square values is significant.

Table 14

Relationship Between High-Low Subject Status Criteria and Interview Rating Scales--Form II

	Criteria							
	High-Low Binet		Very High-Very Low Binet		High-Low PPVT		Very High-Very Low PPVT	
Rating Scale	N	Chi Square[a]	N	Chi Square[a]	N	Chi Square[a]	N	Chi Square[a]
Global Rating of Family	28	.654	18	.321	30	.150	20	.808
Global Rating of Mother	27	.004	18	.562	29	1.338	20	.554
Global Rating of Index Child	28	.144	18	.000	30	.000	20	.808
Global Rating of Siblings	23	.015	16	.017	24	.578	15	3.359*
Listening and Attention	28	.654	18	.000	30	.150	20	.000
Task Furtherance	28	.144	18	.321	30	.542	20	.200
Conceptual Level	28	1.284	18	.000	30	.132	20	.000
Mode of Communication	28	3.046*	18	.000	30	.000	20	.000

Note: High and low designations refer to the top and bottom 40th percentile sections of the respective distributions, while very high and very low designations refer to the top and bottom 30th percentile sections.

[a] Except where asterisked, these values are not significant.

*p $<.10>.05$. The direction of relationship is positive.

Table 15

Significant Findings and "Trends,"

Form I Interview

Item	Criterion or Rating	N	Chi-Square Value^a	p	Finding or Direction of Relationship
Public school attended	High-Low Gates status	2[illegible]	9.166	.05	Ss at P. S. 79 achieved greater gains on Gates than Ss from the other schools
Crowdedness ratio	(1) Global rating of index child in interview	35	2.752	<.10>.05	Less crowded housing conditions are associated with higher ratings
	(2) Behavioral session rating--Rater 2	30	3.348	<.10>.05	Greater crowding conditions are associated with higher ratings
Age mother left the south	Initial Binet scores	22	(t=2.333)	.05	Mothers staying in the south longer bore (index) children higher on initial Binet scores
Index child's absence from school	High-Low Binet scores	35	3.431	<.10>.05	More frequent absences were associated with greater gains on Binet
Last grade mother completed	(1) Global family rating	36	5.325	<.10>.05	Positive relationship
	(2) Global rating of siblings	33	7.419	.05	Mothers who completed high school bore children rated higher

Table 15 (continued)

Item	Criterion or Rating	N	Chi-Square Value[a]	p	Finding or Direction of Relationship
Mother's response to being asked questions by children	(1) Global rating of index child in interview	36	5.433	.02	Mothers who like being asked questions have (index) children rated higher
	(2) Global rating of family	36	3.515	$<.10>.05$	Mothers who like being asked questions have families rated higher
	(3) High-Low Gates status	28	4.375	.05	Mothers who like being asked questions bore (index) children who achieve greater gains on Gates
Children's assessment of whether mother likes to be asked questions	(1) Global rating of index child in interview	32	3.333	$<.10>.05$	Where children feel mother likes being asked questions, index child is rated higher
	(2) High-Low Gates status	25	11.582	.001	Where children feel mother likes being asked questions index child achieves greater gains on Gates
Children's assessment of whether it bothers mother if they talk while she's working around house	Global rating of mother	27	3.750	$<.10>.05$	Where children indicate it does bother mother, mother is rated higher

[a] Unless otherwise indicated, statistical tests performed were chi-square analyses (Yates corrected). See text for contingency classifications upon which analyses were performed.

Table 16

Additional "Trends," Form I Interview

Item	Criterion or Rating	N	Chi-Square Value[a]	p	Direction of Relationship
Public school attended	Global rating of index child in interview	36	4.866	$< .20 > .10$	Ss at P. S. 90 were rated higher than Ss at P. S. 68, 79, or 175
Number of persons present at interview	Mode of communication	36	2.319	$< .20 > .10$	Where fewer persons were present at interview family members were rated higher
Accuracy of mother's schooling estimate for index child	Global rating of mother	19	3.290	$< .20 > .10$	Mothers demonstrating greater accuracy were rated higher
Children's membership in clubs or groups	Global rating of siblings	33	3.976	$< .20 > .10$	Less participation in clubs was associated with a higher rating
Does family have mealtime conversations	(1) Behavioral session rating, Rater 1	29	2.426	$< .20 > .10$	Indication of mealtime conversation was associated with a higher rating of index child
	(2) Behavioral session rating, Rater 2	30	2.026	$< .20 > .10$	(Same as above)
Children's assessment of whether it bothers mother if they talk when she's shopping	High-Low Binet status	26	2.588	$< .20 > .10$	Where children felt it does not bother mother index child achieved greater gains on Binet

---

[a] Yates corrected. See text for contingency classification upon which analyses were performed.

Table 17

Significant Findings and "Trends," Form II Interview

Item	Criterion or Rating	N	Chi-Square Value[a]	p	Finding or Direction of Relationship
MCPS--Conformity	(1)Global rating of index child in interview	30	4.885	.05	Children who were more conforming on the basis of the MCPS were rated higher in cognitive style
	(2)Rating of mode of communication	30	2.978	$<.10>.05$	Children scoring higher in conformity come from families rated higher
MCPS--Aggressivity	Global rating of index child in interview	26	4.964	.05	Children higher in aggressivity were rated lower
ITPA--Composite score	(1)Global rating of siblings	23	3.693	$<.10>.05$	Index children who score higher on the ITPA have siblings rated higher in cognitive style
	(2)High-Low Binet status	26	7.583	.01	Positive relationship
Sex of index child	Initial PPVT score	30	7.350	.01	Males score higher than females
Number of persons present at the interview	(1)Global rating of index child in interview	30	2.990	$<.10>.05$	The fewer the number of persons the higher the rating
	(2)Global rating of family	30	3.906	.05	Same as above
Number of permanent household residents	Number of persons present at interview	30	6.335	.02	Positive relationship

Table 17 (continued)

Item	Criterion or Rating	N	Chi-Square Value[a]	p	Finding or Direction of Relationship
Last grade mother completed	(1) Global rating of index child in interview	17	2.842	<.10 >.05	Mothers with less schooling have children rated higher in cognitive style
	(2) ITPA composite score	28	2.871	<.10 >.05	Positive relationship
Does index child talk to adults	Global rating of index child in interview	30	4.366	.05	Those children who speak to adults are rated higher in cognitive style
Stability of eating arrangements	High-Low Binet status	17	3.904	.05	Stable eating arrangements are associated with greater gains on the Binet
Books index child reads	ITPA composite score	17	5.581	.02	Index children who read books other than school books score higher on the ITPA
Mother's knowledge of index child's school activities	High-Low Binet status	24	2.780	<.10 >.05	Mother's greater familiarity with index child's school activities is associated with greater gains on the Binet

[a] Yates corrected. See text for contingency classifications upon which analyses were based.

Table 18

Additional "Trends," Form II Interview

Item	Criterion or Rating	N	Chi-Square Value[a]	p	Direction of Relationship
MCPS--Maturity	Rating of family's conceptual level	28	2.296	<.20 >.10	Ss who scored higher in Maturity came from families rated high
MCPS--Aggressivity	(1) Global rating of family	26	1.711	<.20 >.10	Ss scoring higher in Aggressivity came from families rated low
	(2) Global rating of siblings	22	2.550	<.20 >.10	Ss scoring lower in Aggressivity came from families with siblings rated high
	(3) Rating of task furtherance	26	1.994	<.20 >.10	Ss scoring low in Aggressivity came from families rated high
	(4) High-Low Binet status	23	2.091	<.20 >.10	Ss scoring high in Aggressivity were those who achieved the greatest gains on the Binet
MCPS--Inhibition	Rating of mode of communication	30	1.782	<.20 >.10	Ss scoring high in Inhibition came from families rated low
MCPS--Hyperactivity	High-Low Binet status	28	2.394	<.20 >.10	Ss scoring high in Hyperactivity tended to be those who achieved the greatest gains on the Binet

Table 18 (continued)

Item	Criterion or Rating	N	Chi-Square Value^a	p	Direction of Relationship
ITPA composite score	(1)Rating of mode of communication	28	2.506	$< .20 > .10$	Ss scoring high on the ITPA tended to be those from families rated high
	(2)Rating of listening and attention skills	28	2.243	$< .20 > .10$	Ss scoring high on the ITPA tended to be those from families rated high
	(3)Rating of conceptual level	28	2.179	$< .20 > .10$	Ss scoring high on the ITPA tended to be those from families rated high
Date index child entered IDS program	High-Low PPVT status	30	1.874	$< .20 > .10$	Earlier entrants achieved smaller gains on the PPVT than filler Ss
School index child attends	High-Low PPVT status	30	6.040	$< .20 > .10$	Ss at P. S. 68 tended to achieve greater gains on the PPVT than Ss at P. S. 79, 175, or 200
Number of persons present at interview	(1) Global rating of siblings	24	2.090	$< .20 > .10$	Where fewer persons were present a higher rating was givsn to siblings
	(2)Rating of mode of communication	30	2.241	$< .20 > .10$	Where fewer persons were present a higher rating was given to the family
Number of siblings older than index child	Global rating of index child in interview	20	1.714	$< .20 > .10$	Where there was none or only one older sibling, index child was rated high

Table 18 (continued)

Item	Criterion or Rating	N	Chi-Square Value[a]	p	Direction of Relationship
Do children ask father questions	(1) Global rating of family	13	2.166	$<.20 >.10$	Families where children ask father questions were rated high
	(2) Global rating of siblings	11	2.387	$<.20 >.10$	Siblings who indicate they ask father questions were rated high
Children's assessment of whether it bothers mother if they talk while she's working around the house	(1) High-Low PPVT status	27	1.837	$<.20 >.10$	Those mothers who were reputedly bothered tended to have index children who achieved greater gains on the PPVT
	(2) Global rating of index child in interview	27	1.980	$<.20 >.10$	Mothers who were reputedly not bothered tended to have index children rated high
Mother's knowledge of index child's school activities	High-Low PPVT status	14	2.240	$<.20 >.10$	Mothers familiar with child's activities tended to have index children who made the smallest gains on the PPVT
Are your children alike or different	MCPS--Conformity	26	2.520	$<.20 >.10$	Mothers who said their children are different tended to have index children scoring high on Conformity

[a] Yates corrected. See text for contingency classifications upon which analyses were based.

Appendix A

Final Report for Interim Research Period,

September 1, 1968, to August 31, 1969

Chapter I

Summary of Objectives of Investigation

The research described involves an attempt to construct "profiles" of those whom we shall call unsuccessful or successful learners (judged through longitudinal criteria) after several years of exposure to the Institute for Developmental Studies' demonstration and enrichment classes in four Harlem public schools in New York City. We were interested in ascertaining the differences between children who have made progress and those who have made little or no progress. The variables in which we were (and still are) interested, and which we will use to make the comparisons, fall into familial, cognitive, and communicational dimensions. The data we have collected, we should add, may yield important considerations for radical educational innovation.

An eventual "hard core" target population might well come from the ranks of those children on whom interventive and compensatory programs seem to make little or no impact. It could be that stress on cognitive style and communicational systems rather than on devices and aids, say, to teach reading, may be of tangible future significance. We would hope to be able to offer some generalizations as to the "why" of "gainers" and "nongainers" which go beyond the more conventional test approach but which are individually diagnostic, nevertheless.

Our chief objective, then, was to identify certain extremes in our pupil population--that is, those who profit from compensatory education and those who do not. We were interested in discovering the psychosocial parameters of these two subsamples so that we would be in a better position than we are at present to make recommendations about intervention and change with regard to the children for whom the usual interventive techniques are not eminently successful.

In our original proposal, we outlined some important educational implications of this investigation, stemming from a basic consideration: why are some children, regardless of initial levels of general ability, unable (or less able) to profit from, to use, to absorb from, educational programs designed for them as the "target" population? Why are other (equally disadvantaged) children able (or more able) to gain, despite similarities in cultural background and ethnic status to that of the lower gainers? We thought, perhaps, that we had been looking at possibly important variables in the wrong way, or perhaps that we had not been teasing out the significant variables.

It was the overall purpose of this year's investigation to look at family systems, family interactions, and individual children's behavior from a point of view, a framework, that subsumes cognitive and communicational style variables in ways which differ from the framework of more traditional methods. The overall hypothesis of this research relates to the possibility that family "systems" and "milieus"--viewed in terms of how family members communicate with, and send "messages" to one another (their characteristic communicational style)--may provide various kinds of perspectives and "rules for behavior" that become internalized by the school-going members. Further, we hypothesized that these perspectives mediate (enhance or curtail) the children's abilities to listen, attend, conceptualize, sit still, etc.--abilities which are crucial to learning situations, be they formal or informal. (In the design of our research, we should note, however, that we had not ruled out the possibility that other, more "conventional" sociological and psychological variables may also play an important role in determining achievement-status, and indeed, we have included such variables in our interview schedule.)

To achieve our purposes, we developed a family interview, for use with families in a group situation, which encourages all members of the family to participate. This interview affords one or more raters the opportunity (we have used two rater-interviewers) to rate the family system for communicational and cognitive level on scales we have developed. We also developed and pilot-tested behavioral tasks for small groups of children which permitted the relevant communicational and cognitive behaviors to emerge--behaviors which were rated along the same communicational dimensions noted above.

In sum, then, we identified groups of children who had several years of exposure to the Institute's demonstration classes in Harlem elementary schools as either high gainers and low gainers in terms of several criteria (independent of initial IQ levels), and then attempted to relate various socio-psychological, background, communicational, and cognitive style variables to the status of the child (high or low), that is, in terms of his ability to profit from the enriched educational program in which he had participated for several years.

Our expectation was that the high gainers and the low gainers could be identified ("blindly"--through observer-raters) in the behavioral sessions by their cognitive styles and that their families could be characterized by certain psychosocial, language, and communicational features that would emerge and be observed and rated in a specially developed family interview (by a different set of observers who did not know the status--in terms of achievement--of the index child). We expected also, that we could develop reliable methods for eliciting and assessing the behaviors in which we were interested.

Chapter 2

Sample and Methodology

To recapitulate briefly our procedures: From the 1968-1969 group of fourth graders who had been "graduated" from all of the Institute's third-grade classes, relatively recent "fillers" were eliminated to insure a sample with maximum exposure to the enrichment program. From this group, a sample was selected on the basis of two criteria--high, or little or no gains on the Stanford-Binet test, and on the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary test. Gains were defined as increments from an initial point (three years prior and two years prior for the two instruments respectively) to a later point (1968) in time.

The two pupil-extremes thus identified were characterized by: (a) familial and background factors as well as ratings of "family systems" as to communicational and cognitive style, obtained by trained interviews (going into the homes) working with reliable observational methods and rating techniques; and (b) cognitive-style ratings of the children themselves randomly assigned to small "cognitive-style" sessions in which their communicational and language behavior was carefully observed and (reliably) rated by raters with no prior knowledge as to whether S̲ is a gainer or nongainer.

To achieve the foregoing, major efforts were devoted to developing a reliable interviewing technique for assessing the family members communicational system as well as more "conventional" parameters; in addition, the development of behavioral tasks for our cognitive style sessions also required months of research activity, as did the development of rating scales for use in both of these assessment situations.

The current chapter describes in detail our efforts with regard to the foregoing: (a) sample; (b) the development of the behavioral sessions and the tasks; (c) the development of the family interview; and (d) the rating scales. Appendix A presents the coded interview schedule that finally emerged as a result of our intensive research efforts in the past year.

The Sample

From the fourth graders in Public Schools 68, 79, 90, and 175 in Harlem, all children who had been in the Institute's third-grade classes were placed into an initial pool. From this pool, only those children who had had at least three years of exposure to the Institute's program, that is, entered in 1963 or 1964 at kindergarten or prekindergarten, were further selected. There were 36 such Ss. Table 1 presents the mean age, sex, and "filler status" of this group for each school and for schools combined. An examination of the discrepancy scores were made for these Ss in the following manner (see Tables 3-6):[1]

(1) High gainers and low gainers on the Stanford-Binet mental age discrepancy criterion. High gainers were defined as those 14 Ss whose discrepancy score was at least 2 years, 8 months (the top 40% of the sample). Low gainers were those 14 children whose discrepancy score was 2 years or less (the bottom 40% of the sample). The range of discrepancy scores is 2 years, 8 months to 4 years, 1 month for the former, and 2 years to 1 year, 2 months for the latter group.

(2) Very high and very low gainers on the Stanford-Binet mental age discrepancy criterion. Very high gainers were defined as those 11 children whose discrepancy score was at least 2 years, 10 months (the top 26% of the sample). Very low gainers were those 9 children whose discrepancy score was 1 year, 10 months or less (the bottom 23% of the sample). The range of discrepancy scores is 2 years, 10 months to 4 years, 1 month for the former, and 1 year, 10 months to 1 year, 2 months for the latter group.

(3) High gainers and low gainers on the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary Test. High gainers were defined as those 12 children whose discrepancy

---

[1] Categories (1) and (3) contain categories (2) and (4).

score is at least 6 standard units (the top 39% of the sample). Low gainers were those 11 children whose discrepancy score was 2 standard units or less (the bottom 38% of the sample). The range of discrepancy scores is 6 standard units to 19 standard units for the former, and +2 standard units to -6 standard units for the latter group.

(4) Very high and very low gainers on the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary Test. Very high gainers were defined as those 9 children whose discrepancy score was at least 10 standard units (the top 27% of the sample). Very low gainers were those 9 children whose discrepancy score was negative (the bottom 29% of the sample). The range of discrepancy scores is 10 standard units to 19 standard units for the former, and -1 standard unit to -6 standard units for the latter group.

Tables 3 through 6 present various characteristics of the high gainers and low gainers, selected on the basis of the foregoing criteria. Table 3 compares initial mean Standard-Binet mental age scores (1965) of high and low gainers, and very high and low gainers. It can be seen from this table that the high and low groups thus designated do not significantly differ from each other in initial mean mental age scores. Table 4, which presents mean chronological ages (as of September, 1968) for the high and low groups, also shows that high gainers do not significantly differ from low gainers in chronological age.

Table 5 presents the initial mean Stanford-Binet mental age scores (1965), and Table 6 the mean chronological ages (September, 1968), of the high and low gainers as determined by the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary change scores (Spring 1966-Spring1968). These tables show that, both in terms of initial mental ages as well as chronological ages, high gainers do not differ significantly from low gainers as defined by their discrepancy scores.

The above findings are of considerable significance to the purpose of our study, for they indicate that initial levels of general ability or of chronological age do not determine whether an S is designated as high or low in terms of the criteria we have used. They confirm our expectation that we must look elsewhere for variables that determine a child's change in the years of exposure to the Institute program. The current study represents an attempt to isolate at least some of the relevant variables.

Table 2 presents the number of index children eventually seen in the small group behavioral sessions (randomly assigned in terms of high and low status). Only 30 of the original 36 Ss were observed and "blindly" rated in these sessions, since six children moved out of the school district before the sessions were run. Table 2 also shows that all 36 of the families are involved in our interviewing procedures. As a matter of fact, at this writing, 35 of the 36 families have been interviewed.

The Behavioral Sessions

The pilot-testing of the cognitive style tasks was described in detail in the Progress Reports. A complete description of these tasks is presented at the end of this section. As can be seen, the behavioral sessions comprise a wide variety of tasks, permitting a range of relevant responses to occur and allowing the raters to observe different facets of cognitive style. We have found, for example, that Fifteen Questions (Task 3), elicits behaviors from which the observers can "judge" abstract thinking, logicality of thought, and the ability to ask questions. The Individual Picture Sequencing situations (Task 7) brought forth such thinking and language behaviors as the ability to form logical sequences, to make logical transitions, and to use elaborative language. The ability to put oneself in the place of the other was reflected in the Role Playing situation (Task 5). It should be noted, however, that there was not necessarily a one-to-one relationship between a task and a behavior to be rated. Such behaviors as listening ability, attention, task furtherance, and awareness of others, for example, cut across all tasks.

We have met the problem of eliciting ratable behavior from the shy or quiet child, easily overshadowed by more vocal or expressive children, by introducing three individual tasks: Individual Picture Sequencing (Task 7), Story Retelling (Task 8), and Enactment (Task 9). In these situations, each child had a chance to "perform."

In general, we feel that our tasks have adequately tapped the behaviors in which we were intersted. Moreover, the children enjoyed the sessions, spontaneously interacted among one another, and responded with sufficient variation along the behavioral dimensions in which we were interested to permit some range in the ratings which were made.

Leader-Rater Roles. Pilot-testing had indicated to us that our plan to have one experimenter administer the individual tasks while another experimenter administers the group tasks (with alternation of these roles), as discussed in Progress Report 32, was not feasible. Since both Es also perform as raters at the end of the session, their inability to observe two simultaneous activities for rating purposes forced us to employ only one leader to "run" the sessions. The same leader was used for all the sessions. In addition, two rater-observers were present during the sessions--the same two for all sessions.

Ratings. We decided to give each child one global rating (instead of several ratings) on cognitive and communicational style as a result of pilot-testing experiences (P.S. 100 on West 138th St.). We found that various aspects of cognitive and communicative style were not easily analysable into mutually exclusive areas. Further, the separate rating scales did not consistently reflect the variety of behaviors exhibited in the session; nor were the behaviors subsumed by the scales consistently exhibited by each child in the behavioral sessions.

Pilot-testing experiences with the group of rating scales described in Progress Report #2 also indicated to us the need for two more middle-scale points. Accordingly, there were six points on the single scale we employed:

Overall Rating for Cognitive and Communicational Style[2]

6____ 5____ 4____ 3____ 2____ 1____ X____

POOR

GOOD

can't rate; no opportunity to observe

---

[2] Note, the additional steps in the scale continue to force the rater to make a choice in the direction of (1) good or (6) poor cognitive and communicational style.

Ratings for each child were made immediately after the session was completed. The two raters were the same research staff members who assumed major responsibility for the development of the cognitive style tasks. Thus, they had ample experience in watching for the relevant behaviors as they emerged.

The global rating was based on a "summary" impression of behaviors which the raters built up while carefully observing the children as the behavioral sessions progressed. As an aid, the raters referred to and actually checked various points on the several scales employed in the family interview. Specifically, these "work" scales included: Mode of Communication; Listening and Attentional Skills; Responses to or Awareness of the Listener and Others in the Group; Task Furtherance and Completion; Transitions and Sequencing; and Conceptual Level of Communication: Abstractness, Elaboration, and Clarity. In addition, the raters kept running notes on each child during the sessions, pertinent to the qualities reflected in our conceptualizations about cognitive style.

Since four was considered the optimum number of children per group, six non-experimental children were added as "fillers" to our sample of thirty, so that each session would contain four children. Randomization was obtained by shuffling cards containing the names of the experimental children in each school and selecting the first four, the next four, etc., as members of any one group. The raters and leader did not know the composition of the groups--that is, who the "highs" or "lows" might be. Testing was completed in June.

The Behavioral Tasks

The development of the behavioral tasks and the extensive pilot-testing involved in this process have been presented in detail in the Progress Reports for the currently described investigation.

Unless otherwise indicated, the following tasks were presented to the children as a group situation in the behavioral sessions:

(1) Play. This was introduced with:

PRETEND THAT NEXT WEEK YOU HAVE TO PRESENT THE SCHOOL PLAY IN THE AUDITORIUM. PLAN IT AND TELL ME HOW YOU GO ABOUT IT AND WHAT YOU WILL DO. AFTER YOU HAVE ALL THE ARRANGEMENTS MADE, WE WILL GIVE YOU SOME PUPPETS TO ACT OUT THE PLAY WITH--BUT FIRST PLAN IT.

(2) Group Picture Sequencing. Four pictures from the Wiltwyck Family Interaction Apperception Test (FIAT) presented in Minuchin et al. (1967) were given to the children with the following instructions:

HERE ARE SOME PICTURES. YOU SHOULD ARRANGE THESE IN SOME ORDER AND ALL AGREE ON A STORY.

(3) Fifteen Questions. The instructions were:

NOW WE ARE GOING TO PLAY FIFTEEN QUESTIONS. LET ME TELL YOU HOW THE GAME GOES. I AM GOING TO THINK OF AN ANIMAL AND YOU HAVE TO GUESS WHICH ANIMAL BY ASKING ME QUESTIONS. I CAN ONLY ANSWER YES OR NO TO YOUR QUESTIONS. AND YOU CAN ONLY ASK 15 QUESTIONS SO DON'T WASTE ANY. DON'T ASK ME THE NAMES OF SPECIFIC ANIMALS, BUT ASK ME QUESTIONS ABOUT THE ANIMALS AS "IS IT BIG?" OR "DOES IT HAVE LONG EARS?" WHOEVER GUESSES THE ANIMAL WINS.

The categories of vegetable and fruit were employed after the above procedure.

(4) Television. This task was introduced with the following:

LET'S PRETEND YOU TWO ARE THE CHILDREN AND YOU TWO ARE THE PARENTS. NOW THE CHILDREN WANT TO WATCH A SPECIAL TELEVISION PROGRAM THAT IS ON LATE TONIGHT, BUT THE PARENTS DON'T WANT THEM TO. YOU, AS CHILDREN, GIVE THE PARENTS REASONS WHY YOU SHOULD BE ABLE TO WATCH IT AND YOU AS PARENTS, TELL THEM WHY NOT.

(5) Role Playing. Puppets were put on a table and introduced with:

HERE IS A FATHER, A MOTHER, AND TWO CHILDREN. NOW MAKE BELIEVE THE FATHER COMES HOME AND SAYS "LISTEN CAREFULLY BECAUSE I HAVE SOMETHING VERY IMPORTANT TO TELL YOU." ACT OUT WHAT THE FATHER SAYS AND WHAT HAPPENS NEXT.

The following situation was then presented with the required puppets:

TWO MOTHERS AND A TEACHER ARE HURRYING TO THE PRINCIPAL'S OFFICE. ACT OUT WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THEY GET THERE.

(6) Group Agreement. The instructions were:

NOW ALL OF YOU HAVE TO AGREE ON A PRESENT FOR YOUR TEACHER. DECIDE ON WHAT ONE THING YOU WOULD ALL LIKE TO GIVE HER.

(7) Individual Picture Sequencing. Each child was given three pictures from a series called Teaching Pictures, Resource Sheets (Tester, 1966) and told the following:

EACH OF YOU IS GOING TO GET SOME PICTURES. YOU ARE TO PUT THEM IN SOME ORDER AND TELL A STORY ABOUT THEM.

During this task, the rest of the children listen to each child's presentation.

After Task (7) was completed, the group of four was divided into two dyads for the administration of Tasks (8) and (9). Two of the children were seated by themselves and given materials with which to draw while the other two were with the leader. After Tasks (8) and (9) were completed with the first group, the two groups exchanged positions and the leader administered these tasks to the second group.

(8) Story Retelling. This was administered in the following manner:

I WILL TELL (NAME CHILD #1) A STORY. HE WILL THEN TELL IT TO (NAME CHILD #2). HERE IT IS:

STORY A

CAROL WAS LOOKING FOR A CHRISTMAS PRESENT FOR HER SISTER. CAROL CHOSE A PRETTY GREEN SWEATER. WHEN CAROL GOT HOME, SHE SAW THAT THE SALESLADY HAD GIVEN HER A SWEATER THAT WAS MUCH TOO BIG FOR HER SISTER. "OH WELL," SAID CAROL, "I GUESS I DID THE CHRISTMAS SHOPPING FOR MY MOTHER'S PRESENT TODAY."

NOW I WILL TELL YOU A STORY (NAME CHILD #2) AND THEN YOU WILL TELL IT TO (NAME CHILD #1).

STORY B

BILL WAS ON HIS WAY TO SCHOOL. BILL STOPPED AT ALBERT'S HOUSE TO CALL ALBERT. "ALBERT, ALBERT," HE CALLED. ALBERT'S MOTHER CAME TO THE WINDOW AND SAID, "YOU'RE LATE TODAY. ALBERT HAS ALREADY LEFT FOR SCHOOL." BILL RAN ALL THE WAY TO SCHOOL. BUT ALBERT WASN'T THERE. BILL HAD RUN SO QUICKLY THAT HE PASSED ALBERT AND GOT TO SCHOOL FIRST.

It was decided not to record the stories verbatim as described in Progress Report #2. Child #1 and child #2 were then presented the Enactment Task with the following:

(9) Enactment.

SHY: NOW I WANT YOU TO DO A LITTLE ACTING, AS THOUGH YOU WERE IN A PLAY. ________(NAME), YOU WILL PLAY THE PART OF THE TEACHER, AND ________(NAME), YOU WILL PLAY THE PART OF A LITTLE BOY/GIRL. ______, YOU HAVE JUST RETURNED FROM A TRIP TO THE ZOO. AND______, YOU ARE GOING TO ASK_____ABOUT IT.

NOW_____, I WANT YOU TO BE A PARTICULAR KIND OF LITTLE BOY/GIRL. THIS BOY/GIRL IS VERY SHY. HE/SHE DOESN'T LIKE TO TALK UP IN CLASS, AND HE/SHE ISN'T A VERY GOOD TALKER. THE TEACHER MUST HELP HIM/HER TO TALK UP. YOU GET HIM/HER TO TALK.

BOLD: Same situation with the following change:

NOW, WE HAVE THE SAME SITUATION AGAIN--YOU ARE THE BOY/GIRL WHO HAS JUST COME BACK FROM THE ZOO. BUT, YOU ARE A VERY DIFFERENT KIND OF BOY/

GIRL FROM THE FIRST TIME. YOU ARE VERY BOLD. A BOLD CHILD IS TALKATIVE AND LOUD: THE OPPOSITE OF SHY. AND _____, YOU ARE STILL THE TEACHER. AND YOU KNOW THAT THIS BOY/GIRL IS BOLD--AND YOUR JOB IS TO TRY TO KEEP HIM FROM TALKING TOO MUCH.

Now child #1 and child #2 drew while Tasks (8) and (9) were administered to child #3 and child #4.

The Family Interview

The first stage of pilot-testing of the home inverview schedule was completed during the first few weeks of May. These pilot interviews were also used to train and orient the interviewers with regard to the specific and overall purposes of the interview and the kinds of observations of family interaction that are necessary for the family ratings. Using the schedule presented in Progress Report #2, the interviewers (two at a time) visited four ghetto families with the purpose of determining need for further revisions in the interview schedule and rating scales.

Progress Report #1 outlined our thinking about the characteristics of communicational and cognitive style which we think are related to the relative abilities of children to profit from, to make strides in, an enrichment program such as the one the Institute has been running. We noted then that our belief was that such styles arose from the experiences of the children growing up in certain types of family systems which generated different kinds of communicational styles--variables which could be, we thought, observed and rated, provided that the family members are given an opportunity to interact with one another in group, communicational situations. We were also interested, as noted at that time, in exploring other characteristics of the families (of a demographic nature, for example). Our task then became one of devising an interview situation which would yield several levels of behavior. These included demographic and interactive data, as well as data based on opportunities for family communication to arise. Previous Progress reports described the development of this interview, in its various forms.

We should note that the interview, as we developed it, possessed the following characteristics, among many others:

(1) As many members of the family as were available were interviewed simultaneously.

(2) As far as possible, interview items were devised so that they

could be directed to the family as a group, providing an opportunity to observe family dynamics, such as who takes over, who makes the decisions, through whom are the "messages" sent, as well as other levels of family interaction such as the nature of its communication, its noise level, etc.

(3) We introduced specific family-oriented "tasks" in the interview situation to provide opportunities for the rating of cognitive and communicational styles.

As a first step in the development of our interview, we made a thorough assessment of the available literature and metnods, but leaned particularly heavily on the Institite's own interview schedule especially developed for this population (see Bloom, Whiteman, & Deutsch, 1967) and the Deprivation Index based on empirical research with this schedule (see Whiteman, Brown, & Deutsch, 1967). Other sources for our items included: the schedule developed for an ongoing Institute research, Lower SES Child Rearing and Cognitive Differentiation (Deutsch, 1968); the schedule developed for the Center for Urban Education's Bedford-Stuyvesant study (1967); and the community self-survey schedule developed at the University of Iowa. Milner's report (1951) was quite helpful to us in conceptualizing some significant areas for the interview.

Item types examined for possible use included a large variety of questions concerning demographic data and a large pool of items assessing family interaction, the latter including such areas as child rearing practices, expression of positive and negative attitudes toward the children, and opportunities for and encouragement of verbal interaction. An extremely large pool of possible items was thus collected, from which we selected, modified, or rewrote items in accordance with our own needs:

(1) We were forced to exclude certain items not because of possible irrelevance, but because of time considerations: if we were to use a

lengthy interview schedule, there would not be sufficient time or interest on the part of the family to permit inclusion of the behavioral tasks essential for testing our hypotheses. Examples of items eliminated at this point are: number of appliances in the home; financial aspirations of parents; parental rating of neighborhood schools; and some aspects of child rearing practices. In general, most areas of possible relevance for our purposes were included, but in some instances, additional, more specific items were excluded.

(2) We eliminated or modified items on the basis of inappropriate conceptual level of their content. The Institute has vast experience with interviewing individuals from a ghetto population, especially the black ghetto. Queries involving some degree of abstraction or generalization on the part of the respondent have been found to be somewhat unsuccessful in eliciting responses; in addition, questions dealing with affect or which require introspection tend to elicit action-oriented, rather than feeling-oriented, responses. Many items were thus either reworded or eliminated on the basis of a priori as well as empirical considerations concerning the clarity of communication to the respondent, and his ability to respond on the conceptual level required.

(3) Items were eliminated or modified in terms of the usual criteria concerning awkward or value-laden wording which would put the interviewee on guard.

(4) We modified items to avoid the traditional mother-oriented questions so as to encourage family participation in responding to the items, as well as to reduce the possibility of establishing a set wherein only the mother or other parental figure responds. That is, interview items were designed or modified so as to encourage family interaction, both of a verbal or nonverbal nature. In the current interview schedule, some items are directed to the children only, some to the mother (and father, if present), and a large

number of items is directed to the entire family.

The interview schedule (see Appendix A, which contains the detailed coding instructions for the revised interview) as introduced to the families covered the following areas:

(1) Demographic data. Physical mobility of family; crowdedness; composition, size, and intactness of family unit; family's health; parents' education and aspirations for children; parents' employment; and family's community participation.

(2) Interactive data. Parents' knowledge of activities and whereabouts of their children; role assignment and stablity of roles in the family; availability of adults for verbal interchange; encouragement of verbal interchange with adults; availability of reading material and encouragement of reading; family relationships in affective areas.

(3) Cognitive and communicational data. Family members' interaction and verbal and interchanges around content-questions designed to elicit a range of communicational behaviors--these behaviors provided, together with all preceding behavior, an opportunity for the raters to observe and rate the family on scales to be described in the next section.

In addition to the foregoing, data based on various observations of the home were obtained through ratings with respect to: type of building and condition of home interior.

As noted, ratings based on cognitive and communicational variables represented an extremely important portion of the data to be obtained from the family sessions. These are described at the end of this chapter.

The interviewing team for the formal interviews was composed of three staff members, one white (female) and two black (males). The staff member (female) who had major responsibility in the development of the interview schedule and considerable experience in its use was present at all interviews while each of the two men, depending on their schedules and availability of families, were assigned (as close to randomly as possible) to particular interview sessions.

In several progress reports, it was stated that the black and white interviewers would be randomly assigned to the role of either interviewer or recorder for each interview (both roles involve making ratings at the end of the interview). We decided, however, to permanently assign the role of recorder to the white staff member in order to consistently use black interviewers in each of the family sessions.

It should be noted that the team's roles allowed for considerable flexibility of function. Although the active interviewers were the primary questioners, the recorder was encouraged to clarify any answers, correct any omissions made by the questioners, and offer additional probes believed to be necessary. This allocation of roles was found to be agreeable to all members of the interviewing team, seemed to work well within the family interviews, and has permitted both questioners and recorders to develop considerable expertise in their individual roles.

Training of the interviewers prior to pilot phases included role-playing sessions. Careful discussion of all aspects of the interview experience followed each pilot interview and served as further training. The latter procedure was also necessary for refining and polishing the interview schedule itself as well as the rating scales. Although the interviewers had thoroughly familiarized themselves with the schedule prior to the first pilot interview, there is no doubt, we might add, that the most valuable training emerged from the pilot interviews themselves.

The Pilot Interviews. The four pilot families were contacted with the help of the Institute's community aides--ghetto residents who are assigned to the schools from which the current sample is drawn. The initial contact with these families was made by an aide who requested the family's permission. Each family was then called by a member of the interviewing team who scheduled the interview. So far, all interviews were scheduled for late afternoon or early evening since this seemed to be the most convenient time for the families and staff.

The four families were receptive to the aides and interviewer when contact was first made and receptive to the interview team during the actual interview. This pattern continued throughout the interviewing period. Each family (pilot as well as experimental) was paid $10.00 for its participation in the interview, and was so informed when first contacted. This remuneration was given to the family head in cash in an envelope at the beginning of each interview. The payment was rendered immediately after the initial introductions were made in the home so that the family would not feel that payment was contingent upon their interview performance.

The interviews lasted approximately an hour and a half and did not seem to tire either the family members or interviewers. All family members were encouraged to be present during the entire interview. This has not presented a major problem (although some children occasionally wandered in and out of the room in which the interviews were held.)

After the first four pilot interviews, the interview schedule was analyzed in depth by the research staff. Although the major areas to be covered during the interview had remained unaltered (see Progress Report #2), several changes were made at this point. These involved revisions in actual content as well as other changes, for example, in the sequence, wording, and suggested probes for some of the questions.

The family interview schedule is, of course, designed to elicit family interaction. To this end, a number of questions was directed to the entire family. During piloting, it was found that even though questions were directed to the group as a whole, some of these (for example, "How do you feel about this apartment compared to the one you lived in before you moved here?") consistently elicited responses from the head of the house only. Thus, major changes were made in the sequences of questions, to ensure full family participation from the beginning of the interview. Those questions which tended to be answered by an adult family member only were moved to a later point in the interview, while those that were found to encourage interaction were moved to earlier points.

After piloting, some questions which seemed to overlap with others were omitted altogether as were those which tended to elicit vague answers from the respondents, or had been deemed not relevant to the research problem. Those questions considered highly relevant in content were analyzed thoroughly. Probes and additional parts were added to maximize their content, and more explicit direction was provided for the interviewers to acquire the desired information.

To the greatest extent possible, questions amenable to precoding were coded at this point. Those questions that could not precoded tended to be those that provided possibilities for qualitative observations of behavior for rating purposes. These had been purposely left open-ended to allow for extensive family interaction.

The rating scales (see below) were found to be applicable to the behavior observed during the pilot interviews. It was felt, however, that a four-point scale was too limiting for the wide range of behavior observed, even in the four pilot families. Thus, the scale was extended to six points, with points 3 and 4 slightly above and below a hypothetical "average cognitive style" for any individual scale.

The rating for overall communicational level presented great difficulty for the interviewers, who frequently found that the components of the family unit (e.g., siblings and mother) differed in their styles of communication. This difficulty was resolved by constructing four separate ratings for: family as a whole; mother or parents; siblings; and index child. Thus, although a global family rating was still obtained, a greater differentiation among family members was now possible.

The "Formal" Interviews: Coding Procedures

To date, thirty-six of the thirty-seven sample families have been interviewed. The remaining family has been contacted numerous times by the interviewers for appointments, however. On several occasions, the interviewers visited this family at the scheduled time and found either that all or most family members were not at home or else were not prepared to be interviewed. Most of the interviews were completed during the months of June and July. Other interviews have been conducted this fall since some families left the city during the summer or sent their children to camp. Those families who have been seen by the interviewers have shown great cooperation, it might be noted. With almost all interview data in, preparation is being made for key punch operations and consequent analysis of the data. A final corrected version of the coding instructions has been completed (see Appendex A) and punching operations, at this writing, are about to begin.

The development of coding procedures for the interview has been a time-consuming process due to the length of the interview and the extensive qualitative material to be analyzed. As noted, wherever possible, interview questions were precoded to facilitate data collection. Precoding was not possible for open-ended items, however. The staff began to formulate codes for the qualitative material as soon as it was gathered. During the month of July, a sample of half of the family interviews was analyzed in depth to allow for the development of preliminary coding sheets. Using these initial coding instructions, two members of the research team were assigned the task of transferring the data from the interview to the code sheets. This procedure was carried out independently by each of the two staff members for each interview. For every interview, these same staff members compared their individually compiled code sheets to ascertain consistent interpretation of codes. Where discrepancies existed, coders either rectified one coder's erroneous catergorization, or if the discrepancies were attributable to disagreement rather than error, notations were made as to possible existence of problems concerning the appropriateness or clarity of the item itself.

Once the preliminary coding was completed, one of the principal investigators and one of the coders (who was also the recorder during the home interviews) checked each item for discrepancies between coders and for categories that did not seem adequate for the data (e.g., items with numerous responses coded in the "other" category). Additional changes were then made such as simplifications, additions, and omissions, until the final set of coding instructions was devised.

Some problems faced by the coders were created by the very nature of the interview. One difficulty arose because this was indeed a "family" interview and several individuals could respond simultaneously to the same question. One example of this situation is provided by an item which asked the family where they they would like to move. Conceivably (and in actuality), a parent could have named one or more locations, while other family members might have offered a number of varying or congruent opinions. In this particular case, the wide variation of responses within the same interview prevented the development of a meaningful code and the item was eliminated.

Another problem was encountered in the interpretation of certain items. For example, Item 4 of the interview questioned parents as to their occupational and educational aspirations for their children. A precoded section under this item necessitated the recorder's checking whether the parent did or did not differentiate among the children in his or her aspirations for them. Coders were unable to agree, however, on an interpretation of the meaning of "differentiation" in this context, and thus, this particular aspect of the item was omitted although other components of the item were retained.

The coders also faced some difficulties with certain codes that required a more thorough analysis of qualitative data as well as an examination of responses to several questions. For example, Items 15 and 16 of the coding instructions require the coders to rate the stability of the family's eating arrangements (a single rating). To arrive at this index, coders must carefully read responses to the questions: "Who usually eats breakfast at home?"; "Why doesn't /_ specific family member _/ eat here?"; "Who fixes breakfast?"; "Do you eat together?"; "If not, why not?"; "Which family members usually eat dinner together?"; "Why doesn't /_ specific family member _/ eat here?"; and "Who fixes dinner?"

Certain items were eliminated from the interview as a result of coding procedures because it was found that the responses did not discriminate among the families. An example is Item 38c of the interview, presence of books or magazines in the home (all families said they had books and/or magazines). Other items did not elicit a range of responses, or elicited material which did not yield the type of data considered valuable or relevant. These eliminated items constitute an additional step of interview revision. Appendix A therefore presents an accurate picture of the family interview as revised through piloting, formal interviewing, and coding procedures.

The Rating Scales

(1) Rating for Overall Communicational Level

Illustrations of behavior reflected in this overall, general rating (actually, all ratings and their content enter into this overall rating):

> logical inconsistencies, shifting of content, contradictory, conflicting messages; many paraverbal messages; confusion about time, place, and specifics of an event being discussed; frequent interruptions of spoken messages, high noise levels, etc.; communications are delivered in a way which suggests that speaker does not expect to be heard; or if heard, messages are not expected to elicit a response from others; adults in the family do not expect children to focus selectively on most communications; (A la Piaget) nonsocial, egocentric verbalization, i.e., "egocentric verbal externalization"; unedited, abbreviated, subjective, idiosyncratic messages in situations calling for nonidiosyncratic messages; chaotic, disorganized quality of communications

Family

6 ___	5 ___	4 ___	3 ___	2 ___	1 ___	X ___
poor or low over-all level					good or high over-all level	can't rate; no opportunity to observe

Mother (Parents)

6 ___ 5 ___ 4 ___ 3 ___ 2 ___ 1 ___ X ___

Siblings

6 ___ 5 ___ 4 ___ 3 ___ 2 ___ 1 ___ X ___

Index Child

6 ___ 5 ___ 4 ___ 3 ___ 2 ___ 1 ___ X ___

(2) Mode of Communication

Illustrations of behavior reflected in this rating:

preference for paraverbal, gestural modes for communicating; language is minimally used for exchange of information; subject emits more "noise" than message; high motility

6	5	4	3	2	1	X
prefers paraverbal mode of communication					prefers verbal mode of communication	can't rate; no opportunity to observe

(3) Formal Aspects of Communication (1): Listening and Attentional Skills

Illustrations of behavior reflected in this rating:

remains disengaged or detached from task or situation at hand, even though encouraged or urged to participate; shows poor listening skills; attention wanders, even though S (or family members) appears to be listening, the nature of his response indicates that he has not completely focused on what has been said

6	5	4	3	2	1	X
shows poor listening and attentional skills					shows good listening and attentional skills	can't rate; no opportunity to observe

(4) Formal Aspects of Communication (2): Responses to or Awareness of the Listener and Others in the Group

Illustrations of behavior reflected in this rating:

- difficulties in changing and shifting the level of a message according to the characteristics of the listener; difficulties in communicating some aspects of another person (other than overt behavior) to a third person; difficulties in predicting responses of others in certain kinds of situations; difficulties in assuming the role of the other; difficulties in continuing stories in terms of the other's perspective; poor skills in emitting messages with "shared meanings"; poor skills in communicating the observed to the other

6	5	4	3	2	1	X
responses to and/or awareness of others in the group are inadequate					responses to and/or awareness of others in the group are adequate	can't rate; no opportunity to observe

(5) Formal Aspects of Communication (3): Task Furtherance and Completion

Illustrations of behavior reflected in this rating:

lack of concern with completing the task; failure to ask orienting questions; fails to exhibit exploratory behavior directed at solving and/or deciding on a task's structure; emits messagesirrelevant to a task's progress

6	5	4	3	2	1	X
fails to further task, or interrupts task-completion					furthers task or helps to complete it	can't rate no opportunity to observe

(6) Formal Aspects of Communication (4): Transitions and Sequencing

Illustrations of behavior reflected in this rating:

fails to signal interruptions or to provide cues to others that he is interrupting; makes irrelevant interruptions; difficulties in understanding that topics and verbal interchanges frequently have sequential aspects; responses not always along lines of communications that have preceded them; failure to follow, or continue topic of the other; disjointedness of verbal exchanges; irrelevant shifts; interrupts own or others' thoughts or verbalizations; introduces unrelated themes

6	5	4	3	2	1	X
poor transitional and sequential skills					good transitional and sequential skills	can't rate; no opportunity to observe

(7) Conceptual Level of Communication: Abstractness, Elaboration, and Clarity

Illustrations of behavior reflected in this rating:

communications are barren and frequently devoid of the kind of detail in content necessary for exchange of information; preference for concrete rather than abstract language in situations in which more symbolic, conceptual material is required ; specific referents of messages are not clarified; referents are not made explicit; or there are shifts in referents; new referents not identified as such

6	5	4	3	2	1	X
poor conceptual skills					good conceptual skills	can't rate; no opportunity to observe

(8) Content Aspects of Communications or Messages

Illustrations of behavior reflected in this rating:

tends to produce contradictory messages; objective content of message is sacrificed for other kinds of content (power, relational, affective, etc. in re: E or group or family members); messages are transmitted to establish personal hierarchies, power, or role--that is, they are relationship rather than content messages; verbal or paraverbal messages are inappropriate in content

6	5	4	3	2	1	X
poor skills in communicating objective content of messages					good skills in communicating objective content of messages	can't rate; no opportunity to observe

(9) Especially for mother or family leader:

Introspectiveness ("looking at one's own behavior")

Illustrations of behavior reflected in this rating:

difficulties in responding to queries and topics relating to subjective content (inability to describe own feelings or to describe inferences about children's feelings or thoughts); paucity of response is more marked in this area than with more objective content; inability to verbalize content of introspection to others

6	5	4	3	2	1	X
poor introspective skills					good introspective skills	can't rate no opportunity to observe

(10) Especially for mother or family leader:

Generality of Responses to Others

Illustrations of behavior reflected in this rating:

fails to differentiate responses to individual members of the group; reprimands nearest child rather than source; anger is generalized to all members of the group rather than source

6	5	4	3	2	1	X
generalizes responses to others					individualizes responses to others	can't rate; no opportunity to observe

(11) Mother or Parental Figure's Role in Maintaining the "Rules" of Effective Communication

Illustrations of behavior reflected in this rating:

mother or family leader does not seem to enforce, or to expect members to follow, the "rules" of communication, i.e., listening, expecting a response, not shifting, etc.; mother or family leader fails to redirect or refocus subject matter of family discussion to the relevant topic, that is the subject-matter at hand

6	5	4	3	2	1	X
fails to enforce "rules" of effective communication					enforces "rules" of effective communication	can't rate; no opportunity to observe

Chapter 3

Early Findings; Abstract of Continuation Research

The material presented in this chapter is based on results of initial data analysis procedures, and consist of reliability findings (interrater agreement in the behavioral sessions) and findings based on the relationship between the "high" or "low" achievement status of S and the rating he received in the behavioral session. These findings are reported immediately below. This brief chapter ends with a description of the continuation research (1969-1970) which is well underway.

It should be noted that the interview we developed is now coded and the extensive data it yielded are being prepared for the computer. Findings based on the relationship of interview content and ratings of high or low achievement status and performance in the behavioral sessions cannot, therefore, be reported. These findings should yield not only much material of considerable relevance to the purposes of our investigation, but also many important considerations on which an ultimate revision of our interview should be based.

Reliability of Ratings--Cognitive Style Behavioral Sessions

Interrater agreement was indexed by means of Cohen's weighted kappa (1968). As a statistic, weighted kappa not only corrects for chance agreement, but also allows for differential weighting of disagreements according to the degree of gravity of such disagreements. It was therefore possible to weight scale point disagreements on the same side of the implicit midpoint less heavily than disagreements across the midpoint of the rating scale. The weights employed for this procedure ranged from 0 to 5; the larger the weight, the greater the disagreement. A weight of 0 indicates no disagreement, and a weight of 5 indicates maximum disagreement. Table 7 presents the frequency distribution of the ratings by paired observers for the cognitive style behavioral sessions. Table 8 contains a matrix of the weights we employed in computing weighted kappa. These data yielded a reliability coefficient (weighted kappa) of .51 resulting in a *z* of 3.92 ($p < .0002$, two-tailed), indicating high interrater agreement. The foregoing analysis is based on 34 cases remaining after the elimination of ratings where one observer each used the "can't rate" category. It should be noted (see Table 2) that 30 *S*s in the behavioral sessions were experimental *S*s although the initial sample consisted of an *N* of 36. Six *S*s were not seen in the behavioral sessions because they had transferred out of the school district during the academic year, 1968-1969. However, six nonexperimental *S*s were added to the group seen in the behavioral sessions in order to maintain a consistent size of four *S*s for each session. The reliability findings reported currently were therefore based on 34 subjects, of whom 29 were experimental *S*s (the category "can't rate" was used for two subjects, one of whom was an experimental *S*).

An unweighted kappa (based on grouped data by dichotomizing scores on either side of the scale midpoint) was also computed for the data. Table 9 presents the distribution of observers' overall ratings by midpoint split into good and poor cognitive style designations. These data yielded a reliability coefficient (unweighted kappa) of .53, resulting in a *z* of 3.14 ($p < .002$, two-tailed). As with weighted kappa, reported above, unweighted kappa was highly significant, again indicating a high degree of interobserver agreement.

Relationship of High and Low Achievement Status and Cognitive Style Ratings

Table 10 presents the frequency distributions of cognitive style ratings (behavioral sessions) for high and low gainers and very high and low gainers as defined by Binet mental age discrepancy scores, and Table 11 presents frequency distributions for the same ratings in terms of the Gates-MacGinitie high and low designations. Point biserial correlation coefficients (Nunnally, 1967) and *t* tests were computed for these data to examine the relationship between these subject designations (based on achievement at school) and the cognitive style behavioral ratings.

Point biserial coefficients were used because of the nature of the data. The rating scale employed, for example, was essentially a dichotomous scale--with a forced choice rating made above or below the implicit scale midpoint.

It was expected that there would be a positive correlation between discrepancy score measures and cognitive style ratings. That is, those subjects who increased most on a given measure (MA or vocabulary score), the high gainers, would tend to be rated "good" in cognitive and communicational style in the behavioral sessions, and those subjects who increased least on a given measure would tend to be rated "poor" in cognitive style in the behavioral sessions.

Table 12 presents the results of analyses of the relationship between Binet discrepancy scores and the behavioral ratings. Point biserial coefficients and *p* values based on *t* tests indicate that the relationship is a negligible one or due completely to chance. Our hypothesis in regard to expecting a positive relationship between high or low subject designations and ratings made of behavior in specially developed "cognitive style" sessions was thus not borne out. This is true both for the extreme "high" and "low" groups as well as for the larger groups of "highs" and "lows" (see Table 12 for definitions of these samples).

Table 13 presents the results of analyses of the relationship between Gates discrepancy scores and the behavioral ratings. Point biserial coefficients and *p* values based on *t* tests indicate that, as with the foregoing scores, the relationship is a negligible one or due completely to chance. Thus, for both the extreme "high" and "low" groups, as well as for the larger group of subjects (defined in terms of Gates change scores), our hypothesis regarding an expected relationship to the behavioral ratings was not confirmed.

Our present activities in connection with last year's research involve a detailed exploration of family interview content and family ratings as they relate to the index child's behavioral rating in the cognitive style session and the designation of that child as to achievement status. Results of these explorations cannot be currently reported because the data are still being analyzed. In addition, we have begun numerous activities in connection with the continuation research (1969-1970), the objectives and methods of which are briefly described in the next section.

The Continuation Research (1969-1970): Abstract

(1) Objectives. In our current attempts to identify and characterize the extremes of our pupil population--that is, those who profit from compensatory education and those who do not--in terms of various psycho-social parameters, we have developed an instrument of family assessment involving a family interview schedule and a set of rating scales. These methods differ from more conventional methods in their focus on language and communicational processes, and in their focus on family members' interaction with one another. We are continuing this research with a new, but equivalent pupil population in order to replicate and cross-validate the specially developed family interview schedule and cognitive and communicational rating procedures in an attempt to see if the same variables or sets of variables continue to distinguish the high gainers and low gainers. The continuation research, in addition, gives us an opportunity to explore several collateral variables thought to be of significance in understanding the differences between those children who have gained and those who have made little progress.

One of our major long range objectives is to plan relevant and focused educational and remedial strategies in the light of our findings. Another long range objective is to offer the professional community some techniques for assessment and prediction that are highly appropriate for disadvantaged, urban children, specifically: an instrument of family assessment, a set of rating scales for language and communicational styles, and a method for measuring self-concepts for which there will have been accumulated substantial reliability and validity evidence. An additional objective is concerned with the eventual possibility of being able to predict the future academic status of such children as are represented by our sample in terms of various family, communicational, language, and related variables.

In the past year's (1968-1969) procedures, we had not been able to explore the role of self-concept in distinguishing our pupil-groups; nor had we introduced available, standardized instruments for assessing various aspects of language ability. Our purpose, then, in continuing our investigation was to fill these gaps.

(2) Procedures. From the 1968-1969 group of third-graders in our Harlem demonstration classes, after having eliminated relatively recent "fillers" to insure a sample with maximum exposure to the enrichment program, a sample has been selected on the basis of gains on the Stanford-Binet and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. Gains are defined as increments from an initial point (three years prior) to a later point (current) in time. The two pupil extremes thus identified will be characterized by: (a) familial and background factors as well as ratings of "family systems" as to communicational and cognitive style (obtained by trained interviewers going into the homes working with reliable, observational methods and rating techniques); this aspect of the research will enable us to replicate and cross-validate our current family interview and rating procedures; (b) measures of self-concept and self-perception as determined by a Q-sort technique and developed in extensive pilot-testing phases of the current research; and (c) scores on the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities. Extensive reliability explorations of all our measures are planned.

References

Bloom, R.D., Whiteman, M., & Deutsch, M. Race and social class as separate factors related to social environment. In M. Deutsch & Associates, *The disadvantaged child*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967, 309-318.

Center for Urban Education. *Community attitudes in Bedford-Stuyvesant, an area study*, Summer, 1967.

Cohen, J. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1960, 20, 37-46.

Cohen, J. Weighted kappa: nominal scale agreement with provision for scales disagreement or partial credit. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1968, 70, 213-220.

Deutsch, M. Lower SES child rearing and cognitive differentiation. Research Grant number 5 RDL HDO-2804-02, Institute of Child Health and Human Development, U.S. Public Health Service, 1968.

Flavell, J.H. *The development of role-taking and communication skills in children*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968.

Milner, E. A study of the relationship between reading readiness in grade I school children and patterns of parent-child interaction. *Child Development*, 1951, 22, 95-112.

Minuchin, S., Montalvo, B., Guerney, B.G. Jr., Rosman, B.L., & Schumer, F. *Families of the slums: an exploration of their structure and treatment*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967.

Nunnally, J. *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.

Tester, S. Elgin, Ill.: David C. Cook Publishing Co., 1966.

University of Iowa, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, *Community self-survey: a bilingual schedule adaptable to rural and urban, male and female, and various regional populations*.

Whiteman, M., Brown, B., & Deutsch, M. Some effects of social class and race on children's language and intellectual abilities. In M. Deutsch & Associates, *The disadvantaged child*. New York: Basic Books, 1967, 319-336.

Table 1

Mean Age and Sex of Fourth Graders who were in the Institute Program from Prekindergarten or Kindergarten through the Third Grade

Public School	N	Sex	Classification[a]	Mean Age[b]
68	5	M--2 F--3	E	112.00
	4	M--0 F--4	FK	111.75
Total	9			111.88
79	4	M--1 F--3	E	114.00
	2	M--2 F--0	FK	111.50
Total	6			113.17
90	5	M--4 F--1	E	112.00
	5	M--3 F--2	FK	111.80
Total	10			111.90
175	8	M--4 F--4	E	111.25
	3	M--1 F--2	FK	109.00
Total	11			110.54
Total, Schools Combined	22 14		Es FKs	112.04 111.14
	36	M--17 F--19		111.69

[a] E designates subjects who entered the IDS program in prekindergarten (1963); FK designates subjects who entered the IDS program in kindergarten (1964).

[b] As of September, 1968. Converted into months. Mean age for all Ss is just over 9 years, 4 months.

Table 2

Sample of 1968-1969 Fourth Graders who were in the Institute Program
from Prekindergarten or Kindergarten through the Thied Grade:
Ns per School, Families Interviewed, and Index
Children Observed in Cognitive Style
Behavioral Sessions

Public School	Number of Subjects (Index Ss)	Number of Index Families Interviewed	Number of Index Ss observed in Behavioral Sessions
68	9	8[a]	6[b]
79	6	6	6
90	10	10	8[b]
175	11	11	10[b]
Total, Schools Combined	36	35[a]	30

[a] One index family has consented to be interviewed, but this interview has not been completed; once completed, the N for this school will be 9 and for schools combined, 36.

[b] Three children in Public School 68, two children in Public School 90, and one child in Public School 175 were not observed in the behavioral sessions because they transferred out of the school district during the 1968-1969 academic year. The total N observed in the behavioral sessions was therefore 30. Of the six Ss not seen, there was an equal number of males and females. Two of these Ss were, in terms of "filler" status, Fs, and four were FKs (see Table 1 for explanation of these terms). Mean age calculated for the N of 30 is 111.97 months, barely differing from the mean age reported in Table 1 for the 36 Ss, 111.69 months.

Table 3

Initial Mean Stanford-Binet Mental Age Scores (1965) of High and Low Gainers as Determined by Stanford-Binet Mental Age Change Scores (Spring 1965--Spring 1968)

	N	Mean M.A.[a]	S.D.	t	p
High Gainers	14	73.43	7.89	.64	n.s.
Low Gainers	14	71.50	8.08		
Very High Gainers	11	74.00	8.08	.38	n.s.
Very Low Gainers	9	72.56	8.85		

Note.-- High and low gainers are defined by top and bottom 40% of the sample. Very high and very low gainers are defined by top 26% and bottom 23% of the sample. The initial pool had an N of 36 (see Table 1). The experimental sample on which Table 3 is based,however, had an N of 35, because of the lack of Stanford-Binet posttest data for one S.

[a] Converted into months.

Table 4

Mean Chronological Age (September 1968) of High and Low Gainers as Determined by Stanford-Binet Change Scores (Spring 1965--Spring 1968)

	N	Mean C.A.[a]	S.D.	t	p
High Gainers	14	112.21	3.19	.93	n.s.
Low Gainers	14	111.07	3.29		
Very High Gainers	11	112.45	2.54	.51	n.s.
Very Low Gainers	9	111.78	3.35		

Note.-- See Note, bottom of Table 3.

[a] Converted into months.

Table 5

Initial Mean Stanford-Binet Mental Age Scores (1965) of High and Low Gainers as Determined by Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary Change Scores (Spring 1966--Spring 1968)

	N	Mean M.A.[a]	S.D.	t	p
High Gainers	12	72.83	9.78	.63	n.s.
Low Gainers	11	75.09	6.91		
Very High Gainers	9	76.00	8.77	.22	n.s.
Very Low Gainers	9	76.78	5.61		

Note.--High gainers are defined by the top 39% of the sample and low gainers by the bottom 38% of the sample. Very high gainers are defined by the top 27% of the sample, and very low gainers by the bottom 29% of the sample. The initial sample had an N of 36. Since 8 Ss had to be eliminated because of lack of posttest Gates-MacGinitie data for them, high and low status was determined on the basis of 28 Ss.

[a] Converted into months.

Table 6

Mean Chronological Age (September 1968) of High and Low Gainers as Determined by Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary Change Scores (Spring 1966--Spring 1968)

	N	Mean C. A[a]	S.D.	t	p
High Gainers	12	111.25	3.82	1.07	n.s
Low Gainers	11	112.64	2.04		
Very High Gainers	9	111.56	3.78	.79	n.s.
Very Low Gainers	9	112.67	1.94		

Note.-- See Note, bottom of Table 5.

[a] Converted into months.

Table 7

Frequency Distribution of Ratings for Cognitive and Communicational Style--Behavioral Sessions--for Two Raters

	Observer A					
	Ratings for Cognitive and Communicational Style					
Observer B	1 (Good)	2	3	4	5	6 (Poor)
1 (Good)		2				
2	2	1	1			
3		1	5	2		
4		1	4	5	2	1
5			1	1	3	1
6 (Poor)					1	
Total						34

Note.-- Each observer made an overall rating of cognitive and communicational style (see Chapter 2) on the basis of a 6-point scale with anchor points of (1) Good, and (6) Poor. Total N on which this table is based is 36 of which 30 were experimental subjects and 6 were additional Ss randomly assigned to the sessions (see text for explanation). Two Ss were eliminated because they fell into a "can't rate" classification; there was 1 such S for each observer.

Table 8

Weighting Matrix for Disagreements Between Paired Observers in Cognitive Style Sessions--for Reliability Analysis

Observer A

Ratings for Cognitive and Communicational Style

Observer B	1 (Good)	2	3	4	5	6 (Poor)
1 (Good)	0	1	2	3	4	5
2	1	0	1	2	3	4
3	2	1	0	1	2	3
4	3	2	1	0	1	2
5	4	3	2	1	0	1
6 (Poor)	5	4	3	2	1	0

Table 9

Frequency Distribution of Observers' Ratings of Cognitive Style by Midpoint Split[a]

	Observer A		
Observer B	Good	Poor	Total
Good	12	2	14
Poor	6	14	20
Total	18	16	34

---

[a] See Note, Table 7.

Table 10

Frequency Distributions: High and Low Gainers (Upper and Lower 40%) and Very High and Low Gainers (Upper 26% and Lower 23%) as Defined by Binet Mental Age Discrepancy Scores (in Months) and Cognitive Style Rating[a]

Subject Code No.	Mental Age Discrepancy Score	Cognitive Style Rating[b]	
	High Gainers		
202	49	poor	Very High Gainers
225	47	good	
297	39	poor	
230	36	good	
300	36	good	
289	32	poor	
386	32	poor	
484	32	good	
	Low Gainers		
374	24	good	
482	24	poor	
488	24	good	
378	22	good	Very Low Gainers
470	22	good	
212	21	poor	
224	20	poor	
399	20	good	
467	20	poor	
381	16	good	

[a] This table is based on an N of 18 Ss. The initial pool of Ss contained 36 cases, but 6 children had moved out of the school district before the behavioral sessions were run. One additional S was eliminated because there was no available Binet posttest data. Four of the Ss were deliberately eliminated because they fell between established cut-off points, that is, were not regarded as high *or* low gainers on the basis of a priori considerations; and 7 additional Ss were eliminated because of rater-disagreements.

[b] "Good" refers to ratings of 1, 2, or 3 and "poor" to ratings of 4,5, and 6 on the overall scale.

Table 11

Frequency Distributions: High and Low Gainers (Upper 39% and Lower 38%) and Very High and Low Gainers (Upper 27% and Lower 29%) as Defined by Gates-MacGinitie Discrepancy Scores (Standard Units) and Cognitive Style Rating[a]

Subject Code No.	Gates Discrepancy Score (Standard Units)	Cognitive Style Rating[b]	
	High Gainers		
399	19	good	
202	18	poor	
381	17	good	
230	14	good	
216	13	poor	Very High Gainers
378	13	good	
224	12	poor	
374	10	good	
386	8	poor	
	Low Gainers		
476	2	good	
470	-1	good	
294	-1	poor	
297	-2	poor	Very Low Gainers
289	-4	poor	
225	-6	good	

[a] This table is based on an N of 15 Ss. The initial pool of Ss contained 36 cases. Six Ss were not seen in the behavioral sessions, however, because they had moved out of the school district during the year. Six additional Ss lacked posttest data for the Gates, and therefore had to be eliminated, an additional 3 Ss were deliberately excluded because they fell between established cut-off points, that is, were not regarded as high or low gainers on the basis of a priori considerations; and 6 Ss were eliminated because of rater-disagreements.

[b] "Good" refers to ratings of 1,2, or 3 and "poor" to ratings of 4, 5, and 6 on the overall scale.

Table 12

The Relationship Between Stanford-Binet Mental Age Discrepancy Scores (Months) and Cognitive Style Ratings based on the Behavioral Sessions

Cognitive Style Designation	N	Mean Mental Age (Months)	S.D.	t	p	Point Bi-Serial r
Good[a]	10	27.90	9.53	.37	n.s.	-.09
Poor	8	29.62	10.46			
Good[b]	7	28.43	11.31	.19	n.s.	-.06
Poor	5	29.80	13.44			

Note.--See Table 10 for explanation of the Ns involved.

[a] For sample of top and bottom 40% of Ss defined by Binet change scores.

[b] For sample of top 23% and bottom 26% of Ss defined by Binet change scores.

Table 13

The Relationship Between Gates-MacGinitie Discrepancy Scores and Cognitive Style Ratings based on the Behavioral Sessions

Cognitive Style Designation	N	Mean Gates Discrepancy (Standard) Scores	S.D.	t	p	Point Bi-Serial r
Good[a]	8	8.50	9.09	.48	n.s.	.13
Poor	7	6.29	8.62			
Good[b]	7	9.43	9.40	.66	n.s.	.19
Poor	6	6.00	9.40			

Note.-- See Table 11 for explanation of the Ns involved.

[a] For sample of top 39% and bottom 38% of Ss as defined by Gates change scores.

[b] For sample of top 27% and bottom 29% of Ss as defined by Gates change scores.

Appendix B

Interview Schedules, Form I and Form II; Coding Schemes for Each Interview and Frequencies Obtained for Each Coded Part ("Marginals")

The next pages present both forms of the interview and the raw data (frequencies) obtained from the actual sessions. It can be seen from these pages that some minor modifications of items as well as new items were introduced into Form II (see Chapter 5 for explanations as to why these changes were made). Form I interview was pilot-tested and administered as part of the 1968-1969 phase of the study, and Form II was pilot-tested and administered in the 1969-1970 phase of the study (continuation). Elaborate coding schemes were developed in the first year's work, which later were modified, eliminated, or retained in the light of the actual responses obtained. Not only can coding changes from one year to the next be seen from this Appendix, but also differences between the years with regard to actual empirical findings. Note, N for Form I was 36, and N for Form II was 30.

It can be seen from Item I that its parts cover much core data. Not included are the ratings that form an intrinsic aspect of this study. These are described elsewhere in this report.

INTERVIEW ITEMS---FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS---FORM II	CODING---FORM I	CODING---FORM II
ITEM (1) Ask entire family:	ITEM (1)	ITEM (1)	ITEM (1)
Would you please tell me how many people are living in this apartment right now?		Total number of persons physically present at interview (includes all visitors, other relatives, etc. present):	
Would each of you tell me your name and how you are related to (name index child)?	ITEM UNCHANGED	(0) two 0	CODE 3
		(1) three 7	10
		(2) four 10	UNCHANGED 5
Ask each child:		(3) five 6	8
		(4) six 5	1
How old are you?		(5) seven 7	0
		(6) eight 1	2
Do you go to school? (IF YES) What grade are you in? (IF NO) What do you do?		(7) nine 0	1
		(8) ten 0	0
		(9) eleven, twelve, over twelve 0	0
What is the last grade in school you completed?		Parental figure(s) living in household:	
		(1) mother only 27	CODE 17
		(2) father only 0	0
		(3) mother and father only 5	UNCHANGED 12
		(4) grandmother 1	1
		(5) mother and grandmother only 0	0
		(6) mother, father, and grandmother 2	0
		(7) other 1	0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I			CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (1) (continued)			ITEM (1) (continued)	
		Parental figures present at interview:				
		(1)	mother present only	32	CODE	25
		(2)	father present only	0		0
		(3)	mother & father present only	3	UNCHANGED	3
		(4)	grandmother present only	1		1
		(5)	other (specify)	0		1
		Total number of siblings present at interview (includes index child):				
		(0)	one	2	CODE	7
		(1)	two	5		9
		(2)	three	14	UNCHANGED	6
		(3)	four	7		5
		(4)	five	4		1
		(5)	six	4		0
		(6)	seven	0		2
		(7)	eight	0		0
		(8)	nine	0		0
		(9)	ten or over	0		0
		Children other than siblings present at interview (16 and under):				
		(1)	none	30	CODE	23
		(2)	one	3		5
		(3)	two	2	UNCHANGED	2
		(4)	three	1		0
		(5)	four	0		0
		(6)	five	0		0
		(7)	six	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING-----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (1) (continued)		ITEM (1) (continued)	
		Adults other than parental figures present at interview (over 16 years):			
		(1) none	33	CODE	28
		(2) one	3		1
		(3) two	0	UNCHANGED	1
		(4) three	0		0
		(5) four	0		0
		(6) five	0		0
		(7) six	0		0
		Number of people wandering in and out of interview but not present for most of interview:			
		(1) one or more non-participants sporadically present	3	CODE	1
		(2) no non-participants sporadically present	33	UNCHANGED	29
		(3) can't rate	0		0
		Number of family members who are permanent household residents:			
		(0) two	0	CODE	1
		(1) three	3		2
		(2) four	10	UNCHANGED	6
		(3) five	6		4
		(4) six	7		6
		(5) seven	5		4
		(6) eight	3		4
		(7) nine	0		3
		(8) ten	0		0
		(9) eleven and over	2		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (1) (continued)		ITEM (1) (continued)	
		Number of persons who are temporarily living in household:			
		(1) none	34	CODE	30
		(2) one	2		0
		(3) two	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) three	0		0
		(5) four	0		0
		(6) five	0		0
		(7) over five	0		0
		Number of siblings living in household older than index child:			
		(1) none	9	CODE	3
		(2) one	9		6
		(3) two	7	UNCHANGED	10
		(4) three	5		7
		(5) four	2		3
		(6) five	2		1
		(7) six	2		0
		(8) seven	0		0
		(9) over seven	0		0
		Number of female siblings living in home other than index child:			
		(1) none	8	CODE	5
		(2) one	11		11
		(3) two	12	UNCHANGED	4
		(4) three	2		5
		(5) four	1		3
		(6) five	1		2

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (1) (continued)		ITEM (1) (continued)	
		Number of female siblings living in home other than index child: (continued)			
		(7) six	1		0
		(8) over six	0		0
		Number of male siblings living in home other than index child:			
		(1) none	7	CODE	8
		(2) one	12		14
		(3) two	11	UNCHANGED	6
		(4) three	3		1
		(5) four	3		1
		(6) five	0		0
		(7) six	0		0
		(8) over six	0		0
		Age of youngest child living at home (includes index child):			
		(1) index child is only child living at home	2	CODE	1
		(2) infant to 2 years	4		6
		(3) 3 to 5 years	7	UNCHANGED	7
		(4) 6 to 8 years	14		7
		(5) 9 to 11 years	9		9
		(6) can't rate	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (1) (continued)		ITEM (1) (continued)	
		Age of oldest child living at home (includes index child):			
		(1) index child is only child living at home	2	CODE	1
		(2) 9 to 11 years	9		3
		(3) 12 to 14 years	9	UNCHANGED	8
		(4) 15 to 17 years	5		7
		(5) 18 to 20 years	8		11
		(6) 21 years or over	3		0
		(7) can't rate	0		0
		Age and circumstances of non school attendance for siblings 14 and older not in day school:			
		(1) no siblings 14 or over	18	CODE	11
		(2) siblings 14 or over either attending school or high school graduates	14	UNCHANGED	13
		(3) one or more children 14 or over not attending day school and not high school graduates	4		3
		(4) can't rate	0		3

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (1) (continued)	ITEM (1) (continued)
		Age-grade discrepancies noted in siblings (excluding index child):	
		(1) no age-grade discrepancies noted (i.e., five or sex year difference not regarded as discrepancy) 27	CODE 24
		(2) not applicable (either no siblings or siblings not of school age) 2	UNCHANGED 1
		(3) at least one sibling with less than five year difference between age and grade 0	0
		(4) at least one sibling with a seven or more than a seven year difference between age and grade (but no siblings with less than a five year difference) 6	5
		(5) can't rate 0	0
		(6) other 1	0
ITEM (2) Ask children:	ITEM (2)	ITEM (2)	ITEM (2)
Now, let's begin with a question for the children. Are there any grownups you like to talk to besides your mother (parents) or teachers? (Probe if	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	Does index child talk to grownups?	
		(1) yes 30	CODE 19
		(2) no 6	UNCHANGED 11
		(3) can't rate 0	0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (2) (continued)	ITEM (2) (continued)	ITEM (2) (continued)		ITEM (2) (continued)	
necessary: for example, are there any friends of the family, relatives or neighbors that you enjoy talking to?) /Specify for each child./		Persons index child speaks to:			
		(0) not applicable, "no" or "can't rate" to part (a)	6	CODE	11
(IF YES)		(1) relative; e.g., grandmother, aunt, cousin, etc.	10	UNCHANGED	3
Who?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	(2) neighbor(s)	10		12
		(3) mother's friend	0		1
What do you usually talk about?	ITEM PART DELETED, FORM II	(4) any combination of (1), (2), (3) above	2		0
		(5) a friend's relative or parent	1		2
About how often do you talk to ________?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	(6) institutional or community representative; e.g., director of neighborhood center, group counselor, school principal, etc.	0		0
		(7) neighborhood storekeeper, clerk	0		0
		(8) vague response, e.g., "man in neighborhood", "man around the corner"	5		1
		(9) can't rate, no answer	0		0
		(X) other	2		0
		Frequency of index child's contact:			
		(0) daily	10	CODE	16
		(1) 3 or more times per week	6	UNCHANGED	1

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (2) (continued)		ITEM (2) (continued)	
		Frequency of index child's contact (continued):			
		(2) once or twice a week	10		2
		(3) every few weeks	1		0
		(4) once a month	1		0
		(5) less than once a month	0		0
		(6) no answer	2		0
		(7) can't rate	0		0
		(8) not applicable, "no" or "can't rate" to part (a)	6		11
		(9) other	0		0
		Do siblings six years of age or older talk to grownups? (include index child):			
		(1) not applicable, no siblings other than index child or no siblings other than index child six years or older	2	NOT CODED, FORM II	
		(2) all talk to grownups	20		
		(3) mixed; some say yes, some say no	10		
		(4) none talk to grownups	1		
		(5) can't rate	3		

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (2) (continued) If all siblings (six years and older) including index child speak to grownups, how frequent is this contact? (1) not applicable, "all talk to grownups" is not checked in part (d) above 17 (2) all talk to grownups daily, or once or twice, or three times per week 16 (3) mixed; some talk to grownups at least once a week, some talk to grownups less frequently 0 (4) all talk to grownups every few weeks or less often 0 (5) can't rate 3	ITEM (2) (continued) NOT CODED, FORM II
ITEM (3) Ask parent(s):	ITEM (3)	ITEM (3)	ITEM (3)
Do you ever see or talk to friends or relatives?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	Does mother have contact with friends or relatives? (1) yes 35 (2) no 1 (3) can't rate 0	CODE 28 UNCHANGED 1 1
(IF YES)			
About how often do you see them?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED		
Where do you usually see them?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED		

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (3) (continued)	ITEM (3) (continued)	ITEM (3) (continued)		ITEM (3) (continued)	
What do you usually talk about when you see them?	ITEM PART DELETED, FORM II				
Do friends or relatives ever visit you?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	Frequency of mother's contact:			
		(0) daily	22	CODE	17
		(1) three or more times per week	5	UNCHANGED	3
		(2) once or twice a week	6		7
		(3) every few weeks	1		1
		(4) once a month	1		0
		(5) less than once a month	0		0
		(6) no answer	0		0
		(7) can't rate	0		1
		(8) not applicable, mother said no contacts	1		1
		(9) other	0		0
		Place of mother's contact with friends or relatives:			
		(1) not applicable, mother said no contacts	1	PARTS (1) to (8)	1
		(2) at mother's or at friends' or relatives' homes (check also if says "home" plus "on telephone")	20	UNCHANGED NOTE: ADDITION	20
		(3) institutional or community facility, e.g., school meetings, church, etc.	2	OF PART (9)	0
		(4) "chancy" meetings or informal encounters, e.g., hall way, street, on the stoop	6		2

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (3) (continued)		ITEM (3) (continued)	
		Place of mother's contact with friends or relatives (continued):			
		(5) vague, e.g., "outside of home"	2		0
		(6) telephone (if mentioned exclusively)	2		0
		(7) can't rate	0		1
		(8) other	3		0
				(9) mixed, combination of two or more of above	6
		Do friends or relatives ever visit mother?			
		(1) yes, unqualified	32	CODE	25
		(2) yes, but with some qualifying remark such as "infrequently"	1	UNCHANGED	1
		(3) no, but observer notes that there were visitors during the interview	1		0
		(4) no, unqualified	2		2
		(5) can't rate	0		2
ITEM (4) Ask parent(s): What kind of job would you like each of your children to have when they grow up? (Specify for each child.)	ITEM (4) ITEM UNCHANGED	ITEMS (4) & (5)		ITEMS (4) & (5)	

INTERVIEW ITEMS---FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODINC----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (4) (continued)		ITEMS (4) & (5)		ITEMS (4) & (5)	
Ask each child:		Mother's occupational aspiration for index child:			
What would you like to be when you grow up?		(0) professional, e.g., teacher, doctor, lawyer, psychiatrist, nurse, cartoonist, architect, business-man	16	CODE	10
		(1) professional athlete	1	UNCHANGED	1
		(2) technical or semi-professional, e.g., practical nurse, computer worker, policeman	1		0
		(3) clerical, secretarial	2		1
		(4) skilled or semi-skilled worker, e.g., carpenter, bus driver	0		0
		(5) unskilled, e.g., construction worker	0		0
		(6) vague, but implying upward aspirations, e.g., "the best possible" or "better than what I've got"	2		3
		(7) wants child to choose own job, e.g., "whatever (he) wants to do"	8		11
		(8) doesn't know, e.g., "haven't thought about it"	5		1
		(9) can't rate	0		2
		(X) other	1		1

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEMS (4) & (5) (continued)		ITEMS (4) & (5) (continued)	
		Index child's occupational aspiration:			
		(0) professional, e.g., teacher, doctor, lawyer, psychiatrist, nurse, cartoonist, architect, etc.	23	CODE	15
		(1) professional athlete	4	UNCHANGED	5
		(2) technical or semi-professional, e.g., practical nurse, computer worker, policeman	2		2
		(3) clerical, secretarial	0		2
		(4) skilled or semi-skilled worker	0		1
		(5) unskilled, e.g., construction worker	2		0
		(6) vague, but implying upward aspiration	0		0
		(7) doesn't know, e.g., "haven't thought about it"	1		1
		(8) can't rate	1		2
		(9) other	3		2

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEMS (4) & (5) (continued)		ITEMS (4) & (5) (continued)	
		Consistency between mother's aspirations for index child and index child's own aspirations:			
		(1) both have professional aspirations	11	CODE	8
		(2) both mention professional athlete	1	UNCHANGED	0
		(3) both have semi-professional or technical aspirations	1		0
		(4) both have clerical or secretarial aspirations	0		0
		(5) both have unskilled aspirations	0		0
		(6) both have same aspiration listed in "other" category	1		1
		(7) discrepancy, mother's aspiration higher than index child's	6		2
		(8) discrepancy, mother's aspiration lower than index child's	2		1
		(9) can't rate, e.g.: either mother or child did not respond, either or both responses vague, etc.	14		18

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEMS (4) & (5) (continued)	ITEMS (4) & (5) (continued)
		Occupational aspirations of children ten years or older (excluding index child):	
		(1) no children other than index child who are 10 years or older 9	CODE 2
		(2) all children verbalize professional aspirations 11	UNCHANGED 10
		(3) all children verbalize professional or semi-professional aspirations 6	4
		(4) mixed; some verbalize professional or semi-professional, some verbalize clerical, secretarial or below 3	2
		(5) all children verbalize clerical, secretarial or below 3	1
		(6) can't rate 4	10
		(7) other 0	1
		Consistency between mother's and children's aspirations--apply for children 10 years of age or older excluding index child:	
		(1) no children other than index child who are ten years or older 9	CODE 2
			UNCHANGED

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEMS (4) & (5) (continued)	ITEMS (4) & (5) (continued)
		Consistency between mother's and children's aspirations--apply for children 10 years of age or older excluding index child: (continued)	
		(2) can't rate; either mother or one or more children did not respond, response vague, etc. 17	19
		(3) mother and all children have professional aspirations 3	5
		(4) mother and all children have semi-professional or technical aspirations 1	0
		(5) mother and all children have unskilled aspirations 1	0
		(6) discrepancy, at least one instance where mother's aspiration is higher than a child's 2	1
		(7) discrepancy, at least one instance where mother's aspirations are lower than a child's 3	2
		(8) other, e.g., if both of above codes are applicable 0	1

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEMS (4) & (5) (continued)		ITEMS (4) & (5) (continued)	
		Accuracy or appropriateness of mother's estimate of schooling for index child:			
		(1) accurate or appropriate	9	CODE	3
		(2) reasonably accurate or appropriate	5	UNCHANGED	6
		(3) little, no, or vague accuracy	5		3
		(4) no answer	0		0
		(5) can't rate	2		1
		(6) not applicable	15		17
		(7) other	0		0
		Accuracy or appropriateness of mother's estimate of schooling for all children (including index child):			
		(1) all estimates made are (1) accurate or appropriate or (2) reasonably accurate or appropriate	10	CODE	7
		(2) mixed; some estimates made are (1) or (2); some are (3)	7	UNCHANGED	1
		(3) all estimates made are (3) little, no or vague accuracy	4		2
		(4) can't rate, e.g., estimates fall in categories (4), (5), (6), or (7)	15		19
		(5) other	0		1

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (6) Ask entire family:	ITEM (6)	ITEM (6)		ITEM (6)	
Do any of you belong to any groups or clubs, for example, a PTA or school organization, youth center, social club, church group, political group, community action group, tenant association, lodge, scouting group, or union? (IF YES) Ask each family member re: each group or club mentioned:	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	Membership in groups or clubs: (a) Mother only:			
		(1) not member of any group or club	17	CODE	11
		(2) inactive member only of one or more groups	5	UNCHANGED	3
		(3) moderately active member only of one or more groups	5		4
What do you do in this group (club, organization, etc.)?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	(4) very active member of at least one group (even if inactive or moderately active in other clubs or groups, check here if very active in at least one group)	9		11
How much time do you spend there? (Probe to determine degree of participation.)	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	(5) other; e.g., has inactive or moderately active membership in two or more groups	0		0
ITEM PART NOT DEVELOPED, FORM I		(6) can't rate	0		1
	Would you say that you are a very active, moderately active, or inactive member of this club? (Parent may be asked to assist in above rating for each child.)	(b) Index child and siblings older than index child:			
		(1) none of above siblings belongs to any club or group	8	PARTS (1)-(5)	11
		(2) most of above siblings (e.g., three out of four, or four out of five) do not belong to any group of club	3	UNCHANGED	0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (6) (continued) (b) Index child and siblings older than index child: (continued) (3) some of above siblings are coded (3)-moderately active, and some (4)-very active, in at least one club or group 14 (4) all of above siblings are coded (4)-belongs, very active in at least one club or group 11 (5) can't rate 0	ITEM (6) (continued) NOTE: ADDITION OF 0 PARTS (6)-(8) 13 0 (6) other 0 (7) mixed; one or more (3)-moderately active or (4)-very active member, one or more (2)-inactive or (1)-not member of any group or club 5 (8) all of above siblings are coded (3)-belongs, moderately active in at least one group or club 1

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (7) Ask parent(s) and any children or other adults of voting age:	ITEM (7)	ITEM (7)		ITEM (7)	
		Does mother vote?			
Do you vote?	ITEM UNCHANGED	(1) yes	31	CODE	23
		(2) no, but is registered	1		0
(IF YES)		(3) no, and is not registered	4	UNCHANGED	6
		(4) can't rate	0		1
How often do you vote? For example, would you say that you vote in: most elections, some elections, or few or no elections?		How frequently does mother vote?			
		(1) most or all elections	24	CODE	18
		(2) some elections	4		4
(IF NO)		(3) few or no elections	3	UNCHANGED	1
		(4) no answer	0		0
Are you registered?		(5) can't rate	0		1
		(6) not applicable, e.g., "no" to part (a)	5		6
		(7) other	0		0
		Does father vote?			
		(1) no father in home or father not present to answer question	31	CODE	17
		(2) yes	4		2
		(3) no,but is registered	0	UNCHANGED	1
		(4) no, and is not registered	1		0
		(5) can't rate	0		10

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (7) (continued)		ITEM (7) (continued)	
		How frequently does father vote?			
		(1) most or all elections	3	CODE	2
		(2) some elections	1		0
		(3) few or no elections	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) no answer	0		0
		(5) can't rate	0		2
		(6) not applicable	32		26
		(7) other	0		0
ITEM (8) Ask parent(s):	ITEM (8)	ITEM (8)		ITEM (8)	
I realize that children often have a large number of friends. However, would you say that you know: most or all of your children's friends many of your children's friends? some of your children's friends?	ITEM UNCHANGED	Extent of mother's knowledge of children's friends:			
		(1) knows most or all	22	CODE	20
		(2) knows many	2		1
		(3) knows some	7	UNCHANGED	5
		(4) knows few or none	5		3
		(5) no answer	0		0
		(6) can't rate	0		1
		(7) not applicable	0		0
		(8) other	0		0
Is this true for all of your children?		Applicability for all children:			
(IF NO)		(1) yes, true for all children	33	CODE	25
Why not?		(2) no, not true for all children	1	UNCHANGED	2
		(3) no answer	0		0
		(4) can't rate	0		2
		(5) not applicable	2		1
		(6) other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (9) Ask each child over 5:	ITEM (9)	ITEM (9)		ITEM (9)	
Do you children usually tell your mother (parents) where you are going after school? (Record for children attending school only.)	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	Do school-age children tell parent(s) where they are going after school? Index child only:			
		(1) usually yes	29	CODE	23
		(2) usually no	3		2
		(3) sometimes yes, sometimes no	2	UNCHANGED	1
		(4) no answer	0		0
		(5) can't rate	0		0
		(6) not applicable	2		4
		(7) other	0		0
		School-age siblings (excluding index child):			
		(1) consensus, usually yes	22	CODE	17
		(2) consensus, usually no	4		1
		(3) some yes, some no	3	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) consensus, sometimes yes, sometimes no	3		0
		(5) can't rate	0		6
		(6) not applicable	4		6
		(7) other	0		0
(IF NO) Why not?	ITEM PART DELETED, FORM II.	If no, why not? (Code only for index child)			
		(1) mother and/or child imply or say that index child refuses to tell, sneaks out, etc.	2	CODE DELETED, FORM II	

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (9) (continued)		ITEM (9) (continued)		ITEM (9) (continued)	
		If no, why not? (Code only for index child) (continued)			
		(2) mother and/or child imply that index child is capable of taking care of himself	0		
		(3) can't rate, e.g., "no" response in part (a) but no answer here	1		
		(4) not applicable, e.g., answer other than "no" to part (a)	33		
		(5) other	0		
Do you usually tell your mother (parents) where you are going in the evening?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	Do children tell parents where they are going in the evening? Index child only:			
		(1) usually yes	22	CODE	18
		(2) usually no	5		4
		(3) sometimes yes, sometimes no	0	UNCHANGED	1
		(4) no answer	0		0
		(5) can't rate	0		0
		(6) not applicable, children not allowed out in evening	9		7
		(7) not applicable, other reason	0		0
		(8) other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (9) (continued)		ITEM (9) (continued)	
		Do children tell parents where they are going in the evening? (continued) Siblings under 14 (excluding index child):			
		(1) consensus, usually yes	21	CODE	12
		(2) consensus, usually no	3		0
		(3) some yes, some no	0	UNCHANGED	1
		(4) consensus, sometimes yes, sometimes no	0		2
		(5) no answer	0		0
		(6) can't rate	1		5
		(7) not applicable, children not allowed out in evening	7		7
		(8) not applicable, other reason	4		3
		(9) other	0		0
		Siblings 14 or over:			
		(1) consensus, usually yes	9	CODE	5
		(2) consensus, usually no	3		1
		(3) some yes, some no	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) consensus, sometimes yes, sometimes no	1		1
		(5) no answer	0		0
		(6) can't rate	3		9
		(7) not applicable, children not allowed out in evening	3		1
		(8) not applicable, other reason	17		13
		(9) other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
ITEM (10) Ask each child attending school: What are some of the things you do with your friends after school?	ITEM (10) ITEM DELETED, FORM II	ITEM (10) Things children do with their friends after school: Index child only: (1) mention of play activity only, e.g., play, swim, play punchball, skip rope, play softball, other ball games, take out bikes, go to after-school play center, etc. 32 (2) mention of any of above plus non-play activity, such as do homework, go to the library, study, etc. 1 (3) mention of any of the play activities above plus other activity 2 (4) mention of homework, library, study, etc., only 1 (5) do nothing, sit around, etc. 0 (6) can't rate 0 (7) other 0 School-age siblings 14 years of age or older: (1) no school-age siblings 14 years of age or older 21	ITEM (10) CODE DELETED, FORM II

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (10) (continued)		ITEM (10) (continued)
		School-age siblings 14 years of age or older (continued):		
		(2) response or responses all appear age-appropriate, e.g., parties for older teenagers, sports for young teenage boys, etc.	8	CODE DELETED,
		(3) at least one (or more) responses imply or state that one or more children come right home after school, activity not specified	3	FORM II
		(4) at least one (or more) responses imply or state that child "does nothing" after school	1	
		(5) can't rate	3	
		(6) other	0	
		School-age siblings under 14 years of age (excluding index child):		
		(1) no school-age siblings under 14 years of age other than index child	4	CODE DELETED,
		(2) responses all appear age-appropriate	29	FORM II
		(3) one or more of siblings state that he (they) do nothing	1	

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (10) (continued)	ITEM (10) (continued)
		School-age siblings under 14 years of age (excluding index child) (continued):	
		(4) can't rate 2 (5) other 0	
ITEM (11) Ask mother:	ITEM (11)	ITEM (11)	ITEM (11)
It may be difficult to remember but would you tell me what each of your children did after school yesterday? (Specify for each child attending school.)	ITEM UNCHANGED	Mother's recollection of children's after school activities of previous day: Recollection of index child's activities:	
		(1) clear recollection 24 (2) vague recollection 8	CODE 21 4
		(3) little or no recollection 2 (4) no answer 0 (5) can't rate 1 (6) not applicable 1 (7) other 0	UNCHANGED 1 0 3 1 0
		Recollection of school-age siblings activities (excluding index child):	
		(1) clear recollection of all children's activities 18	CODE 19
		(2) Mixed; clear recollection of some children's activities; vague little or no recollection of other children's activities 4	UNCHANGED 0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (11) (continued)		ITEM (11) (continued)	
		Recollection of school-age siblings activities (excluding index child) (continued):			
		(3) vague, little or no recollection of all children's activities	7		6
		(4) not applicable, e.g., no school-age children other than index child	5		1
		(5) can't rate	2		4
		(6) other	0		0
ITEM (12) Ask parent(s):	ITEM (12)	ITEM (12)		ITEM (12)	
Do you ask your children to be home at any specific time in the evening? (Record for children over 5.)	ITEM UNCHANGED	Do you ask your children to be home at any particular time in the evening? Index Child:			
		(1) yes	34	CODE	29
		(2) no	0		1
		(3) sometimes yes, sometimes no	1	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) no answer	0		0
		(5) can't rate	0		0
		(6) not applicable	1		0
		(7) other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (12) (continued)		ITEM (12) (continued)	
		Do you ask your children to be home at any particular time in the evening(cont.): Siblings 6-13 (excluding index child):			
		(1) all yes	29	CODE	25
		(2) all no	0		0
		(3) all sometimes yes sometimes no	1	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) mixed; some children yes, some no	0		0
		(5) no answer	0		0
		(6) can't rate	0		0
		(7) not applicable; e.g., no siblings under 14	6		5
		(8) other	0		0
		Siblings 14 and over:			
		(1) all yes	11	CODE	13
		(2) all no	3		5
		(3) all sometimes yes, sometimes no	1	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) mixed; some children yes, some no	1		0
		(5) no answer	0		0
		(6) can't rate	2		1
		(7) not applicable, e.g., no siblings over 14	18		11
		(8) other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (13) Ask parent(s):	ITEM (13)	ITEM (13)		ITEM (13)	
Do you feel that family members should be responsible for doing different things around the house?	ITEM UNCHANGED	Do you feel that family members should be responsible for doing different things around the house?			
		Mother:			
		(1) yes	36	CODE	28
		(2) no	0		1
		(3) mixed; yes and no	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) no answer	0		0
		(5) can't rate	0		1
		(6) not applicable	0		0
		(7) other	0		0
		Father:			
		(1) yes	3	CODE	3
		(2) no	0		0
		(3) mixed; yes and no	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) no answer	0		0
		(5) can't rate	2		10
		(6) not applicable	31		17
		(7) other	0		0
(IF YES) Why do you feel this way? (Probe re: if responsibility is given to teach children, to keep them out of the way, etc.)		If yes, why do you feel this way? Mother:			
		(1) not applicable, e.g., response other than "yes" to part (a)	0		2

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (13) (continued)		ITEM (13) (continued)	
		If yes, why do you feel this way (continued)? Mother (continued):			
		(2) response stresses learning and/or training for the future; re: responsibility, training while children are still young. (Check here even if mentioned in combination with other categories)	16	CODE	14
		(3) response stresses immediate practical household results; e.g., keeping house neater, cleaner, etc.	1	UNCHANGED	1
		(4) response stresses neither training for responsibility nor immediate practical household results; e.g.. "keeps them busy," "keeps them out of trouble," etc.	4		3
		(5) other, but a general conceptual principle seems involved	6		2
		(6) other, vague, non-conceptual response; no principle involved, e.g., says family members should have responsibility but doesn't explain why	8		7

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (13) (continued)		ITEM (13) (continued)	
		If yes, why do you feel this way (continued)? Mother (continued):			
		(7) can't rate	1		1
		(8) other	0		0
		Father:			
		(1) not applicable, e.g., response other than "yes" to part (a)	33	CODE UNCHANGED	27
		(2) response stresses learning and/or training for the future; re: responsibility, training while children are still young. (Check here even if mentioned in combination with other categories	1		2
		(3) response stresses immediate practical household results; e.g., keeping house neater, cleaner, etc.	0		0
		(4) response stresses neither training for responsibility nor immediate practical household results; e.g., "keeps them busy," "keeps them out of trouble," etc.	0		1
		(5) other, but a general conceptual principle seems involved	1		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (13) (continued)		ITEM (13) (continued)		ITEM (13) (continued)	
		If yes, why do you feel this way (continued)? Father (continued):			
		(6) other, vague, non-conceptual response; no principle involved, e.g., says family members should have responsibility but doesn't explain why	0		0
		(7) can't rate	1		0
		(8) other	0		0
How does this work out at your house? I mean, does everyone always or usually do his job? (Probe re: whether mother's attitude is permissive.) (IF NO) Why not?		How does this work out at your house?			
		(1) not applicable, e.g., children do not have specific jobs	0	CODE	1
		(2) works out; e.g., most or all usually do their job	21	UNCHANGED	22
		(3) sometimes works out, sometimes doesn't; e.g., mother has to intervene to get jobs done, children are slow in doing them	5		4
		(4) doesn't work out well	10		3
		(5) can't rate	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
ITEM (14) Ask each child:	ITEM (14)	ITEM (14)	ITEM (14)
What kinds of things do you do around the house?	ITEM UNCHANGED	What kinds of things do you do around the house? Index child only:	
		(1) responsibilities are age-appropriate 28 (2) mixed; some are age-appropriate, some not 0 (3) age inappropriate; too many or too high level responsibilities 2 (4) age inappropriate; too few or too immature responsibilities 4 (5) not applicable, e.g., does not have responsibilities 1 (6) can't rate 1	CODE DELETED, FORM II
		Siblings other than index child:	
		(1) most or all siblings have age appropriate responsibilities 23 (2) mixed; some have age appropriate responsibilities, some do not 3 (3) most or all of siblings responsibilities are age inappropriate; too many or too high level responsibilites 4	CODE DELETED, FORM II

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (14) (continued)		ITEM (14) (continued)		ITEM (14) (continued)	
		What kinds of things do you do around the house (cont.)? Siblings other than index child (continued):			
		(4) most or all of siblings responsibilities are age inappropriate; too few or too immature responsibilities	3		
		(5) not applicable	3		
		(6) can't rate	0		
Do you always do these things or does anyone else ever do them? (Probe re: stability of roles.)		Do you always do these things or does anyone else ever do them? (Code for all siblings)			
		(1) yes; more or less; most of the time	16	CODE	17
		(2) mixed; sometimes unstable or uneven roles and responsibilities, sometimes not	8	UNCHANGED	6
		(3) no, no particular routine; unstable or interchangeable roles	10		2
		(4) not applicable; e.g., do not have responsibilities	1		2
		(5) can't rate	1		3

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (14) (continued)		ITEM (14) (continued)		ITEM (14) (continued)	
What happens if you don't feel like doing the things you are supposed to? (Probe re: mother's response, child's response.)		What happens if you don't feel like doing the things you are supposed to do?			
		(0) not applicable; e.g., children do not have responsibilities	0	CODE	2
		(1) mother makes children do the job; means for doing so might or might not be mentioned	7	UNCHANGED	2
		(2) job just gets done, e.g., "there's no such thing as not feeling like doing something", "just do it," "eventually job gets done"	4		4
		(3) others do the job; "sometimes they switch places," or mother does job (sometimes this response is accompanied by mention of punishment, or mother "fussing at them")	9		8
		(4) mother punishes (physical, denial, restriction, etc.), no mention of job getting done, or if it gets done, mother does it	6		6

ERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS-----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (14) (continued)		ITEM (14) (continued)	
		What happens if you don't feel like doing the things you are supposed to do(cont.)			
		(5) children argue, fight, put up fuss; no mention of job getting done	1	CODE	0
		(6) mother argues, fights, puts up fuss; no mention of job getting done	4	UNCHANGED	1
		(7) nothing happens; status quo, e.g., "room stays a mess"	2		4
		(8) can't rate; response not relevant or not clear cut	3		3
		(9) other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
ITEM (15) Ask entire family:	ITEM (15)	ITEM (15) & (16)	ITEM (15) & (16)
Who usually eats breakfast at home? (Specify family members who do, and those who do not.)	ITEM UNCHANGED	Rating of stability of family's eating arrangements (read all responses, items (15) and (16) before making rating):	
(Ask about family members who don't eat at home.) Why doesn't ________ eat here? Who fixes breakfast? Do you eat together? (IF NO) Why not?		(1) stable eating arrangements: all family members have at least main meal together, may or may not have breakfast together (if not, reality circumstances prevent breakfasting together e.g., father works night shift, or children have differing work or school schedules); mother and/or siblings seem to have moderately stable roles in re: fixing meals 11	CODE 12
		(2) stable arrangements: all family members have main meal together, but breakfast is or tends to be a haphazard affair (however this is not because of reality circumstances); roles in re: fixing meals appear to be fairly consistent 9	UNCHANGED 7

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (16) Ask entire family:	ITEM (16)	ITEM (15) & (16) (continued)		ITEM (15) & (16) (continued)	
Which family members usually eat dinner together?	ITEM UNCHANGED	Rating of stability of family's eating arrangements (read all responses, items (15) and (16) before making rating) (continued):			
(Ask about family members who don't eat together.) Why doesn't ________ eat here?		(3) stable eating arrangements, but subgroups of family fairly consistently eat together rather than all family members; breakfast may or may not be haphazard; cooking arrangements are reasonably stable	11		6
Who fixes dinner?		(4) moderately unstable or haphazard main meal arrangements	4		4
		(5) extremely unstable or haphazard main meal arrangements	0		1
		(6) can't rate	1		0
ITEM (17) Ask entire family:	ITEM (17)	ITEM (17)		ITEM (17)	
Do you usually have conversations during meals?	ITEM UNCHANGED	Do you usually have conversations during meals?			
		(1) yes	25	CODE	25
		(2) no	4		0
(IF YES)		(3) sometimes	7	UNCHANGED	4
What kinds of things do you talk about?		(4) no answer	0		0
		(5) not applicable	0		0
		(6) can't rate	0		0
		(7) other	0		1

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (17) (continued)	ITEM (17) (continued)	ITEM (17) (continued)		ITEM (17) (continued)	
(IF NO) Is there any other time that the family talks together, for example, after school, on weekends, in the evening?		What kinds of things do you talk about?			
		(1) not applicable	4	CODE	0
		(2) check here if fights, arguments, etc. mentioned or if any indication of anti-social behavior, i.e., sibling competitiveness, bickering, disagreeableness	7	UNCHANGED	0
		(3) all other responses	25		29
		(4) can't rate	0		1
		If "no" is checked under (a): Is there any other time the family talks together, for example after school, on weekends, in the evenings?			
		(1) not applicable, "no" is not checked under part (a)	32	CODE	30
		(2) other times specified	3		0
		(3) other times not specified	1	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) can't rate	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (18) Ask entire family:	ITEM (18)	ITEM (18)		ITEM (18)	
How long have you been living in this apartment?	ITEM UNCHANGED	How long have you been living in this apartment?			
		(0) 6 months or less	2	CODE	2
		(1) 7 months to 1 year	4		0
		(2) 1-3 years	5	UNCHANGED	3
		(3) 4-5 years	8		10
		(4) 6-10 years	6		9
		(5) over 10 years	11		6
		(6) no answer	0		0
		(7) can't rate	0		0
		(8) not applicable	0		0
		(9) other	0		0
ITEM (19) Ask entire family:	ITEM (19)	ITEM (19)		ITEM (19)	
Where did you live right before you moved here? (Probe to determine city, state, or neighborhood of New York City.)	ITEM UNCHANGED	Where did you live right before you moved here?			
		(1) mother lived with her own childhood family, i.e., her own mother and father, area may or may not be specified	5	CODE	0
		(2) same building in Harlem	4	UNCHANGED	5
		(3) same block in Harlem	7		3
		(4) other area in Harlem	17		18
		(5) area outside of Harlem	2		2
		(6) can't rate	0		1
		(7) other	1		1

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (20) Ask entire family:	ITEM (20)	ITEM (20)		ITEM (20)	
How do you feel about this apartment compared to the one you lived in before you moved here? for example, would you say that you are: more satisfied, less satisfied, feel about the same way?	ITEM UNCHANGED	Degree of satisfaction:			
		(1) more satisfied	26	CODE	13
		(2) less satisfied	3		10
		(3) feel the same	2	UNCHANGED	2
		(4) no answer	0		0
		(5) can't rate	1		4
		(6) not applicable	4		1
		(7) other	0		0
ITEM (21) Ask entire family:	ITEM (21)	ITEM (21)		ITEM (21)	
Would you like to move again?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	Would you like to move again?			
		(1) yes	29	CODE	26
		(2) no	7		4
		(3) don't know	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) no answer	0		0
		(5) can't rate	0		0
		(6) not applicable	0		0
(IF YES)		(7) other	0		0
Why?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	Why?			
		(1) not applicable; e.g., family does not want to move	7	CODE	4
Where would you like to move?	ITEM PART DELETED, FORM II	(2) poor neighborhood conditions primarily, e.g., junkies, thefts, fear of going out, etc.	6	UNCHANGED	3
		(3) poor housing conditions primarily (other than more space)	2		5
		(4) more space primarily	7		8

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (21) (continued)	ITEM (21) (continued)
		Why would you like to move again? (continued)	
		(5) combination of any two or three 12	7
		(6) can't rate 0	3
		(7) other 2	0
ITEM (22) Ask parent(s):	ITEM (22)	ITEM (22)	ITEM (22)
Altogether, how many times have you moved in the past fifteen years?	ITEM UNCHANGED	Number of times family has moved:	
		(0) none 7	CODE 5
		(1) one 6	7
		(2) two 13	UNCHANGED 11
		(3) three 4	5
Where have you lived? (Look for upward physical mobility.)		(4) four 3	2
		(5) five 1	0
		(6) six 0	0
		(7) over six 1	0
		(8) no answer can't rate not applicable 1	0
What were your reasons for moving?		(9) other 0	0
		Where have you lived? What were your reasons for moving?	
		(1) no moves in past fifteen years 7	5

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING-----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (22) (continued)		ITEM (22) (continued)	
		Where have you lived? What were your reasons for moving? (continued)			
		(2) moves not based on considerations other than reality circumstances; e.g., based on building being torn down, mother and father separated, mother left own home to get married	3	CODE	3
		(3) some or definite indications of upward mobility striving; e.g., moving for more space, better facilities (Check here if this is true for at least one of the moves	24	UNCHANGED	18
		(4) can't rate	2		4
ITEM (23) Ask entire family:	ITEM (23)	ITEM (23)		ITEM (23)	
How many rooms are there in this apartment not including the bathroom?	ITEM UNCHANGED	Number of rooms:			
		(0) one	0	CODE	0
		(1) two	1		2
		(2) three	2	UNCHANGED	2
		(3) four	10		8
		(4) five	15		10
		(5) six	6		8
		(6) over six	2		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (23) (continued)		ITEM (23) (continued)	
		Number of rooms (continued):			
		(7) no answer can't rate	0		0
		(8) not applicable	0		0
		(9) other	0		0
ITEM (24) Ask entire family:	ITEM (24)	ITEM (24)		ITEM (24)	
Are there any members of your immediate family who are not living here right now? (If no answer, ask: for example, any of your children?)	ITEM UNCHANGED	Are there any members of your immediate family who are not living here right now?			
		(1) yes	11	CODE	12
		(2) no	25		13
		(3) can't rate	0	UNCHANGED	0
(IF YES)					
Who?					
How is he (she) related to (name index child)?					
Where is he (she) now?					

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (25) Ask mother if no male head of house present at interview:	ITEM (25)	ITEM (25)		ITEM (25)	
		Does the children's father live here?			
Does the children's father live here?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	(1) yes, permanent resident	7	CODE	12
		(2) yes, temporary resident	0		0
		(3) no	20	UNCHANGED	15
(IF NO)		(4) no (notation that father is deceased)	9		3
		(5) no answer	0		0
		(6) can't rate	0		0
		(7) other	0		0
How long has it been since he lived here?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	How long has it been since he lived here?			
		(1) not applicable, e.g., father lives in household	15	CODE	12
		(2) less than 1 month	0		0
ITEM PART NOT DEVELOPED, FORM I	(If father is deceased) When did he die?	(3) 1 month to 6 months	0	UNCHANGED	2
		(4) 7 months to 1 year	2		3
		(5) more than 1 year	13		8
		(6) never lived in household	5		4
		(7) no answer	0		0
		(8) can't rate	1		1
		(9) other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (25) (continued)	ITEM (25) (continued)	ITEM (25) (continued)		ITEM (25) (continued)	
Do the children ever see him?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	Do the children ever see him?			
(If children see father)		(1) not applicable, e.g., father present or father deceased	16	CODE	15
		(2) yes	14		12
		(3) no	5	UNCHANGED	3
How often do they see him?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	(4) some do, some don't (index child does)	0		0
		(5) some do, some don't (index child doesn't)	0		0
		(6) no answer	0		0
When was the last time they saw him?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	(7) can't rate	1		0
		(8) other	0		0
		How often do they see him?			
		(0) not applicable, e.g., father present, or if absent, children to not see him	21	CODE	18
		(1) daily	3		0
		(2) 3 or more times per week	0	UNCHANGED	3
		(3) once or twice a week	4		1
		(4) every few weeks	2		2
		(5) once a month	1		1
		(6) less than once a month	3		3
		(7) no answer	0		0
		(8) can't rate	2		2
		(9) other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (25) (continued)		ITEM (25) (continued)	
		When was the last time they saw him?			
		(1) not applicable, e.g., father present, or if absent, children do not see him	22	CODE	18
		(2) less than 1 month	11		10
		(3) 1 month to 6 months	0	UNCHANGED	2
		(4) 7 months to 1 year ago	2		0
		(5) more than 1 year ago	1		0
		(6) no answer	0		0
		(7) can't rate	0		0
		(8) other	0		0
ITEM (26) Ask head of house if biological mother of children not present:	ITEM (26)	ITEM (26)		ITEM (26)	
		Does the children's mother live here?			
Does the children's mother live here? (If more than one mother, focus the following questions on mother of index child.)	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	(1) yes, permanent resident	35	CODE	29
		(2) yes, temporary resident	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(3) no	0		1
		(4) no (notation that mother is deceased)	1		0
		(5) no answer	0		0
		(6) can't rate	0		0
(IF NO)		(7) other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (26) (continued)	ITEM (26) (continued)	ITEM (26) (continued)		ITEM (26) (continued)	
How long has it been since she lived here?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	How long has it been since she lived here?			
		(1) not applicable, e.g., mother lives in household	35	CODE	29
		(2) less than 1 month	0		0
		(3) 1 month to 6 months	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) 7 months to 1 year	0		0
		(5) more than 1 year	0		1
ITEM PART NOT	(If Mother is deceased)	(6) never lived in household	0		0
DEVELOPED, FORM I	When did she die?	(7) no answer	0		0
		(8) can't rate	1		0
		(9) other	0		0
Do the children ever see her?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	Do the children ever see her?			
		(1) not applicable, e.g., mother present or mother deceased	36	CODE	29
(If children see mother)		(2) yes	0		1
		(3) no	0	UNCHANGED	0
How often do they see her?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	(4) some do, some don't (index child does)	0		0
		(5) some do, some don't (index child doesn't)	0		0
		(6) no answer	0		0
		(7) can't rate	0		0
When was the last time they saw her?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	(8) other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (26) (continued)		ITEM (26) (continued)	
		How often do they see her?			
		(0) not applicable, e.g., mother present, or if absent, children do not see her	36	CODE	29
		(1) daily	0		0
		(2) 3 or more times per week	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(3) once or twice a week	0		1
		(4) every few weeks	0		0
		(5) once a month	0		0
		(6) less than once a month	0		0
		(7) no answer	0		0
		(8) can't rate	0		0
		(9) other	0		0
		When was the last time they saw her?			
		(1) not applicable, e.g., mother present, or if absent, children do not see her	36	CODE	29
		(2) less than 1 month	0		1
		(3) 1 month to 6 months	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) 7 months to 1 year ago	0		0
		(5) more than 1 year ago	0		0
		(6) no answer	0		0
		(7) can't rate	0		0
		(8) other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (27) Ask parent(s):	ITEM (27)	ITEM (27)		ITEM (27)	
Has anyone in your family ever been hospitalized for anything?	ITEM UNCHANGED	Has anyone in your family ever been hospitalized for anything?			
		(1) no	4	CODE	3
(IF YES)		(2) all for "usual reasons", e.g., surgery, maternity, etc.	30	UNCHANGED	27
Who? For what? For how long?		(3) at least one instance of violence, e.g., fight, shotgun wound, etc.	1		0
In which hospital?		(4) at least one instance of psychiatric reasons, e.g., "nervous breakdown"	1		0
How long ago was this?		(5) can't rate	0		0
		(6) other	0		0
ITEM (28) Ask parent(s):	ITEM (28)	ITEM (28)		ITEM (28)	
Have any of your children had to be absent from school for more than a few days in any one school year?	Have any of your children had to be absent from school for more than a few days during this school year?	Was index child absent?			
		(1) no	16	CODE	18
		(2) yes	20		12
		(3) can't rate	0	UNCHANGED	0
(IF YES)		Reason for index child's absence:			
Which children?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	(1) not applicable, e.g., index child not absent	16	PARTS (1) - (4)	18
Why was this?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	(2) absence due to death, illness and/or accident	19	UNCHANGED	11
How long ago was this?	ITEM PART DELETED, FORM II				

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (28) (continued)	ITEM (28) (continued)	ITEM (28) (continued)		ITEM (28) (continued)	
		Reason for index child's absence (continued):		NOTE: ADDITION OF PART (5)	
		(3) can't rate	0	(5) at least one absence due to playing hooky	1
		(4) other	1		
ITEM PART NOT DEVELOPED, FORM I	How many days was he (she) absent?	Were siblings absent?			
		(1) not applicable, e.g., siblings not absent, or no other siblings	14	CODE	16
ITEM PART NOT DEVELOPED, FORM I	Is this the same, more, or less than for previous years?	(2) all absences due to death, illness, and/or accident	19	UNCHANGED	13
		(3) at least one absence due to playing hocky	2		1
		(4) at least one absence due to reason other than above	1		0
		(5) can't rate	0		0
ITEM (29) Ask parent(s):	ITEM (29)	ITEM (29)		ITEM (29)	
Where were you born? (Probe, if necessary, to determine specific city and state and whether urban, suburban, or rural area.)	ITEM UNCHANGED	Mother's birthplace:			
		(0) northern or western urban or suburban (excluding New York City)	3	CODE	1
		(1) northern or western rural	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(2) southern urban or suburban	10		17

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (29) (continued)		ITEM (29) (continued)		ITEM (29) (continued)	
(If other than New York City)		Mother's birthplace (cont.):			
About how old were you when you left there?		(3) southern rural	12	CODE	5
		(4) New York City	9		3
		(5) Caribbean	2	UNCHANGED	2
		(6) no answer	0		0
		(7) can't rate	0		0
		(8) not applicable	0		0
		(9) other	0		0
Where did you go to school? (Probe re: stability of schooling)		Father's birthplace:			
		(0) northern or western urban or suburban (excluding New York City)	1	CODE	1
		(1) northern or western rural	0	UNCHANGED	0
What is the last grade in school you completed?		(2) southern urban or suburban	0		5
		(3) southern rural	4		1
		(4) New York City	2		3
		(5) Caribbean	0		2
		(6) no answer	0		0
		(7) can't rate	0		0
		(8) not applicable	29		18
		(9) other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (29) (continued)		ITEM (29) (continued)	
		Age mother left birthplace:			
		(1) not applicable, e.g., born in New York City	9	CODE	5
		(2) infant to 5 years	3		1
		(3) 6 to 10 years	2	UNCHANGED	3
		(4) 11 to 15 years	6		3
		(5) 17 years and over	16		18
		(6) no answer	0		0
		(7) can't rate	0		0
		Age father left birthplace:			
				(0) not applicable, e.g., no father in home	18
		(1) not applicable, e.g., born in New York City	31		3
		(2) infant to 5 years	1	PARTS (1) - (7)	0
		(3) 6 to 10 years	0		0
		(4) 11 to 16 years	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(5) 17 years and over	3		9
		(6) no answer	1	NOTE: ADDITION	0
		(7) can't rate	0	OF CODE (0)	0
		Location of mother's schooling:			
		(0) northern or western urban or suburban (excluding New York City)	1	CODE	1
		(1) northern or western rural	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(2) southern urban or suburban	8		14

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (29) (continued)		ITEM (29) (continued)	
		Location of mother's schooling (continued):			
		(3) southern rural	9		4
		(4) New York City	14		6
		(5) Caribbean	0		0
		(6) mixed; but includes New York City	3		5
		(7) no answer can't rate	0		0
		(8) not applicable	0		0
		(9) other	1		0
		Location of father's schooling:			
		(0) northern or western urban or suburban (excluding New York City)	1	CODE	2
		(1) northern or western rural	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(2) southern urban or suburban	0		4
		(3) southern rural	3		1
		(4) New York City	3		3
		(5) Caribbean	0		1
		(6) mixed; but includes New York City	0		0
		(7) no answer can't rate	0		0
		(8) not applicable	29		18
		(9) other	0		1

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (29) (continued)		ITEM (29) (continued)	
		Last grade mother completed:			
		(0) 0-6 years	1	CODE	1
		(1) 7-9 years	9		6
		(2) 10-11 years	14	UNCHANGED	13
		(3) 12 years (high school graduate)	12		9
		(4) 13-15 years (some college)	0		1
		(5) 16 years (college graduate)	0		0
		(6) 17 or more years (college graduate)	0		0
		(7) no answer can't rate	0		0
		(8) not applicable	0		0
		(9) other	0		0
		Last grade father completed:			
		(0) 0-6 years	1	CODE	1
		(1) 7-9 years	0		4
		(2) 10-11 years	2	UNCHANGED	3
		(3) 12 years (high school graduate)	3		4
		(4) 13-15 years (some college)	0		0
		(5) 16 years (college graduate)	0		0
		(6) 17 or more years (college graduate)	0		0
		(7) no answer can't rate	1		0
		(8) not applicable	29		15
		(9) other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (30) Ask father or ask mother about father if father not present but a member of the household:	ITEM (30)	ITEM (30)		ITEM (30)	
		Is father working?			
		(1) works full-time	7	CODE	12
		(2) works part-time	0		0
		(3) unemployed	0	UNCHANGED	0
Are you working?	ITEM PART	(4) laid off or on strike	0		0
		(5) retired	0		0
OR		(6) no answer	0		0
(Mrs. _____, does Mr. _____ work?)	UNCHANGED	(7) can't rate	0		0
		(8) not applicable, e.g., no father in home	29		18
(IF WORKING)		(9) other	0		0
What kind of work do (does) you (he) do?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED				
Is there any kind of work that you (he) would rather do?	ITEM PART DELETED, FORM II				
(IF YES)					
Why?	ITEM PART DELETED, FORM II				
(IF NOT WORKING)					
What kind of work did you (he) do when you (he) were (was) last employed?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED				
When did you (he) last work?	ITEM PART DELETED, FORM II				
Is there any kind of job that you (he) would like to have?	ITEM PART DELETED, FORM II				

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (31) Ask mother:	ITEM (31)	ITEM (31)		ITEM (31)	
Are you working?		Is mother working?			
		(1) works full-time	8	CODE	14
		(2) works part-time	4		7
		(3) unemployed	24	UNCHANGED	9
		(4) laid off or on strike	0		0
		(5) retired	0		0
		(6) no answer	0		0
		(7) can't rate	0		0
		(8) not applicable	0		0
		(9) other	0		0
What kind of work do you do?	ITEM UNCHANGED	Nature of mother's work:			
Who takes care of your children while you work?		(1) not applicable, e.g., mother not currently employed	24	CODE	9
(IF NOT WORKING)		(2) office work, e.g., bookkeeper, postal or department store clerk	4	UNCHANGED	4
Did you ever work?		(3) homemaker, baby sitter, para-professional	5		12
(IF YES)		(4) domestic	1		2
When did you last work?		(5) cleaning, not in private home	1		2
What kind of work did you do?		(6) factory work	1		1
		(7) practical nurse	0		0
		(8) can't rate	0		0
		(9) other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
ITEM (31) (continued)	ITEM (31) (continued)	ITEM (31) (continued)	ITEM (31) (continued)
Who took care of your children while you were working?		Who takes care of children while mother works?	
		(1) not applicable, e.g., mother not currently employed 24	PARTS (1) - (9) 9
		(2) father and/or grandmother or other adult relative 4	UNCHANGED 6
		(3) older sibling(s) or other adolescent family member 1	NOTE: ADDITION 5
		(4) neighbor only 2	2
		(5) friend only (if not specified as neighbor) 0	OF CODES (0) & (X) 0
		(6) paid babysitter 1	0
		(7) mother says care not necessary since children are in school 4	6
		(8) can't rate 0	0
		(9) other 0	0
			(0) mixed; combination of above 1
			(X) mother says no one takes care of children 1
		If mother not currently working did she ever work?	
		(1) not applicable, e.g., mother currently working 12	CODE 21
		(2) yes 22	8
		(3) no 2	UNCHANGED 1
		(4) can't rate 0	0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (31) (continued)		ITEM (31) (continued)	
		When did she last work?			
		(1) not applicable, e.g., mother currently working or never worked	14	CODE	22
		(2) 1 year or less	2		3
		(3) over 1 year to 5 years ago	5	UNCHANGED	1
		(4) over 5 years to 15 years	12		3
		(5) over 15 years	3		1
		(6) can't rate	0		0
		What kind of work did she do?			
		(0) not applicable, e.g., mother currently working or never worked	14	CODE	22
		(1) office or clerical work, e.g., bookkeeper, postal or department store clerk	5	UNCHANGED	4
		(2) homemaker, babysitter, para-professional	3		1
		(3) domestic	2		1
		(4) cleaning, not in private home	2		1
		(5) waitress	1		0
		(6) factory work	5		1
		(7) mixed; combination of above	2		0
		(8) can't rate	0		0
		(9) other	2		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (31) (continued)		ITEM (31) (continued)	
		Who took care of children while she worked?			
		(0) not applicable, e.g., mother currently working or never worked	14	CODE	22
		(1) father and/or grandmother or other adult relatives	12	UNCHANGED	6
		(2) older siblings or other adolescent family members	1		0
		(3) neighbor only	1		0
		(4) friend only (if not specified as neighbor)	2		1
		(5) paid babysitter	0		0
		(6) mother says care not necessary since children were in school	2		1
		(7) mother had no children when last worked	2		0
		(8) can't rate	0		0
		(9) other	2		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (32) Ask children:	ITEM (32)	ITEM (32)		ITEM (32)	
Now, here's another question for you children. Do you ask your mother (parents) a lot of questions?	ITEM UNCHANGED	Do you ask your mother (parents) a lot of questions? Ask mother:			
		(1) most or all children agree, yes	20	CODE	16
		(2) most or all children agree, no	1	UNCHANGED	4
What kind of questions do you ask her (them)?		(3) some children yes, some no (index child yes)	6		7
		(4) some children yes, some no (index child no)	6		2
Do you think she (they) likes to be asked questions?		(5) index sometimes (other siblings combination of yes, no, and/or sometimes)	3		1
		(6) no answer	0		0
		(7) can't rate	0		0
		(8) not applicable	0		0
		(9) other	0		0
		Ask father:			
		(1) most or all children agree, yes	4	CODE	7
		(2) most or all children agree, no	0	UNCHANGED	4
		(3) some children yes, some no (index child yes)	1		0
		(4) some children yes, some no (index child no)	0		2

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (32) (continued)	ITEM (32) (continued)
		Do you ask your mother (parents) a lot of questions? (continued): Ask father (continued):	
		(5) index, sometimes (other siblings combination of yes, no, and/or sometimes) 0	0
		(6) no answer 2	0
		(7) can't rate 0	0
		(8) not applicable 29	17
		(9) other 0	0
		What kind of questions do you ask her (them)? (Code for index child only):	
		(1) not applicable; e.g., index child does not ask questions, no answer for index child, etc. 13	5
		(2) questions pertaining to playing, recreation, etc. e.g., going outside, bicycling, going to the park, going downstairs with friends, watching TV, having company or friends visit, etc. 4	4

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (32) (continued) What kind of questions do you ask her (them)? (Code for index child only) (continued)	
		(3) questions that are information seeking in the following or related areas: school, learning, academic knowledge, homework, furture employment and jobs, word-meanings, etc. 6	5
		(4) questions that are information seeking but more concrete, immediate than above and which tend to yield only immediately useful information, e.g., "what is for dinner?" or "what time is it?" 1	2
		(5) questions which are information seeking but which do not fall in the above categories, e.g., they can relate to general or personal information e.g., "when are we going to move?" or, "when people get in jail, can they get bailed out?" 6	5

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (32) (continued)			
		What kind of questions do you ask her (them)? (Code for index child only) (continued)			
		(6) questions asking for personal guidance or advice	0		0
		(7) mixed; combination of two or more of above	4		7
		(8) can't rate	2		2
		(9) other	0		0
		Do you think she (they) like(s) to be asked questions?			
		Mother			
		(1) most or all children agree, yes	16	PARTS (1) - (9)	11
		(2) most or all children agree, no	9	UNCHANGED	7
		(3) some children yes, some no (index child, yes)	4	NOTE: ADDITION	1
		(4) some children yes, some no (index child, no)	3	OF CODES (9)-(X)	5
		(5) no answer	0		0
		(6) can't rate	3	BELOW	2
		(7) not applicable	0		0
		(8) other	1		0
				(9) most or all children agree, sometimes	1

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (32) (continued)	
		Do you think she (they) like(s) to be asked questions? (continued) Mother (continued)	
			(0) siblings sometimes (index child, no) 2
			(X) siblings agree, sometimes (index child, no) 1
		Father	
		(1) most or all children agree, yes 3	PARTS (1) - (8) 4
		(2) most or all children agree, no 2	UNCHANGED 3
		(3) some children yes, some no (index child, yes) 0	NOTE: ADDITION 0
		(4) some children yes, some no (index child, no) 0	OF PARTS (9) - (X) 1
		(5) no answer 2	0
		(6) can't rate 0	BELOW 3
		(7) not applicable 29	17
		(8) other 0	0
			(9) most or all children agree, sometimes 1
			(0) siblings sometimes (index child, no) 1
			(X) siblings agree, sometimes (index child, no) 0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (33) Ask parent(s):	ITEM (33)	ITEM (33)		ITEM (33)	
Do you like your children to ask you questions?		Do you like your children to ask you questions? Mother:			
		(1) always or usually yes	24	CODE	20
(IF YES)		(2) always or usually no	1		0
		(3) sometimes yes, sometimes no	11	UNCHANGED	8
Why? (Probe for whether wishes to give children information or only permission.)	ITEM UNCHANGED	(4) no answer	0		0
		(5) can't rate	0		2
		(6) not applicable	0		0
		(7) other	0		0
(IF NO)		Father:			
		(1) always or usually yes	3	CODE	2
Why not?		(2) always or usually no	0		0
		(3) sometimes yes, sometimes no	0	UNCHANGED	1
		(4) no answer	0		0
Do you usually answer your children's questions?		(5) can't rate	4		10
		(6) not applicable	29		17
		(7) other	0		0
		If "yes" to parts (a) and/or (b): Why?			
		(1) not applicable, e.g., response other than "yes" checked in parts (a) and/or (b)	9	CODE UNCHANGED	10

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (33) (continued) If "yes" to parts (a) and/or (b): Why? (continued):	ITEM (33) (continued)
		(2) check here even if only one parent stressed the learning and/or conceptual aspects of responding to children's questions, e.g., "I like to know what they're thinking," or "that's the only way they can learn," etc. 14	12
		(3) mother's response indicates that she rather than others should be asked questions, e.g., "I can tell them better than anybody else," or "who else can they ask?" or "that's what a mother is for." Learning and/or conceptual factors not implicit or explicit in response 7	3
		(4) general enjoyment of interaction with children or pride stressed e.g., "I like to talk about things with them." 1	3

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (33) (continued)		ITEM (33) (continued)	
		If "yes" to parts (a) and/or (b): Why? (continued):			
		(5) enjoyment, but interaction with children not an aspect, implicit or explicit, e.g., "I just like to talk."	2		0
		(6) can't rate	3		2
		(7) other	0		0
		If "no" or "sometimes yes, sometimes no" to parts (a) and/or (b): Why not?			
		(1) not applicable; response other than "no" or "sometimes yes, sometimes no" checked	25	PARTS (1) - (7)	22
		(2) response suggests or indicates that parent is sometimes too busy to respond to children's questions	1	UNCHANGED	1
		(3) response suggests or indicates that parent sometimes does not feel well enough to respond to children's questions (inverse may be stated, i.e., parent responds only when she feels physically well enough)	2		2

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (33) (continued) If "no" or "sometimes yes, sometimes no" to parts (a) and/or (b): Why not? (cont.) (4) response suggests or indicates annoyance or irritation with children's behavior when they ask questions, e.g., "sometimes they don't know when to stop talking" or "they ask the same questions over and over again" or "they're all asking questions at the same time" 4 (5) response suggests or indicates a restrictive attitude on parents part, e.g., check here if includes statement such as "there are things they shouldn't talk about" 1 2 (6) can't rate (7) other 1	ITEM (33) (continued) NOTE: ADDITION 3 OF PART (8) 0 1 0 (8) mixed; combination of two or more of above 1

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (33) (continued)		ITEM (33) (continued)	
		Do you usually answer your children's questions? Mother:			
		(1) always or usually yes	32	CODE	28
		(2) always or usually no	0		0
		(3) sometimes yes, sometimes no	4	UNCHANGED	2
		(4) no answer	0		0
		(5) can't rate	0		0
		(6) not applicable	0		0
		(7) other	0		0
		Father:			
		(1) always or usually yes	3	CODE	3
		(2) always or usually no	0		0
		(3) sometimes yes, sometimes no	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) no answer	0		0
		(5) can't rate	4		10
		(6) not applicable	29		17
		(7) other	0		0
ITEM (33.5) ITEM NOT DEVELOPED, FORM I	ITEM (33.5) Ask parent(s): Do you think that there are some things that mothers (parents) should not discuss with their children? (IF YES) What sort of things should not be discussed?	ITEM (33.5)		ITEM (33.5) Does mother think there are some things that mothers (parents) should not discuss with their children? (1) no; mother (parents) says everything should be discussed	23

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
			ITEM (33.5) (continued) Does mother think there are some things that mothers (parents) should not discuss with their children? (continued): (2) yes; mother (parents) says some things should not be discussed 6 (3) can't rate 1 (4) other 0
ITEM (34) Ask entire family Do you ever talk about what has happened in school? (IF YES) What are some of the things you talk about? (IF NO) Why not?	ITEM (34) ITEM UNCHANGED	ITEM (34) Do you ever talk about what has happened in school? (1) most or all school-age children, yes 34 (2) most or all school-age children, no 1 (3) some children yes, some no, (index child yes) 1 (4) some children yes, some no, (index child no) 0 (5) some children yes, some no, (index child no answer) 0 (6) no answer 0 (7) can't rate 0 (8) not applicable 0 (9) other 0	ITEM (34) PARTS (1) - (9) 26 UNCHANGED 1 NOTE: ADDITION 1 OF PART (0) 0 0 0 0 0 0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (34) (continued) Do you ever talk about what has happened in school? (cont)	ITEM (34) (continued) (0) siblings sometimes (index child, no) 2
ITEM (34.5) ITEM NOT DEVELOPED, FORM I	ITEM (34.5) Could you tell me some of the things that (name index child) has been doing in his class in the past month? (Probe for specifics, e.g., "could you tell me about that?")	ITEM (34.5)	ITEM (34.5) Mother's knowledge of index child's school activities: (1) mother appears to be very familiar with child's school activities, e.g., gives specific examples, elaborates on child's successes, etc. 5 (2) mother appears to be somewhat familiar with child's school activities; e.g., gives few and general examples, gives general description only (e.g., "spelling," "math") 11 (3) mother appears to be unfamiliar with child's school activities; e.g., acknowledges that she does not know what the child has been doing 9 (4) can't rate 5 (5) not applicable 0 (6) other 0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I			CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (35) Ask children: Do you children think it bothers your mother if you talk when she's: (a) busy? (b) working around the house? (c) shopping? (d) on the bus or subway? (e) trying to relax? (f) talking with other grown-ups?	ITEM (35) ITEM UNCHANGED	ITEM (35) Do children think it bothers mother if they talk when she's: Busy?			ITEM (35)	
		(1)	yes, most or all children	26	CODE	22
		(2)	no, most or all children	2		0
		(3)	some yes, some no, (index child yes)	1	UNCHANGED	3
(IF YES TO ANY PART)		(4)	some yes, some no, (index child no)	2		1
		(5)	sometimes yes, sometimes no	4		3
How do you know that it bothers her? (Probe, what does she do or say?)		(6)	no answer	1		0
		(7)	can't rate	0		1
		(8)	not applicable	0		0
		(9)	other	0		0
		Working around the house?				
		(1)	yes, most or all children	16	CODE	10
		(2)	no, most or all children	11		13
		(3)	some yes, some no, (index child yes)	3	UNCHANGED	4
		(4)	some yes, some no, (index child no)	0		0
		(5)	sometimes yes, sometimes no	4		1
		(6)	no answer	1		0
		(7)	can't rate	1		2
		(8)	not applicable	0		0
		(9)	other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (35) (continued)		ITEM (35) (continued)	
		Do children think it bothers mother if they talk when she's: Shopping?			
		(1) yes, most or all children	14	CODE	8
		(2) no, most or all children	11		18
		(3) some yes, some no, (index child yes)	0	UNCHANGED	1
		(4) some yes, some no, (index child no)	2		0
		(5) sometimes yes, sometimes no	2		0
		(6) no answer	1		0
		(7) can't rate	2		1
		(8) not applicable	4		2
		(9) other	0		0
		On the bus or subway?			
		(1) yes, most or all children	4	PARTS (1) - (9)	4
		(2) no, most or all children	24	UNCHANGED	20
		(3) some yes, some no, (index child yes)	2		1
		(4) some yes, some no, (index child no)	2	NOTE: ADDITION	2
		(5) sometimes yes, sometimes no	1	OF PART (0)	0
		(6) no answer	1		0
		(7) can't rate	1		0
		(8) not applicable	1		2
		(9) other	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (35) (continued)		ITEM (35) (continued)	
		Do children think it bothers mother if they talk when she's: On the bus or subway (cont.)?			
				(0) siblings, sometimes (index child no)	1
		Trying to relax?			
		(1) yes, most or all children	31	CODE	23
		(2) no, most or all children	2		2
		(3) some yes, some no, (index child yes)	2	UNCHANGED	4
		(4) some yes, some no, (index child no)	1		0
		(5) sometimes yes, sometimes no	0		0
		(6) no answer	0		0
		(7) can't rate	0		1
		(8) not applicable	0		0
		(9) other	0		0
		Talking with grownups?			
		(1) yes, most or all children	30	PARTS (1) - (9)	27
		(2) no, most or all children	3		1
		(3) some yes, some no, (index child yes)	3	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) some yes, some no, (index child no)	0		1
		(5) sometimes yes, sometimes no	0		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (35) (continued)		ITEM (35) (continued)	
		Do children think it bothers mother if they talk when she's: Talking with grownups (cont.)?			
		(6) no answer	0	NOTE: ADDITION	0
		(7) can't rate	0		0
		(8) not applicable	0	OF PART (0)	0
		(9) other	0		0
				(0) some yes, some no (index child, no answer)	1
		How do children know it bothers her?			
		(1) not applicable, e.g., none of above instances bother mother	0	PARTS (1) - (4)	0
		(2) any instance of physical punishment or threat of physical punishment	7	UNCHANGED	1
		(3) any instance (other than above) of excessive vocal expression, e.g., yelling, screaming, hollering	4	NOTE: ADDITION OF PART (5)	3
		(4) all other responses	25		21
				(5) can't rate	5

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (36) Ask children:	ITEM (36)	ITEM (36)		ITEM (36)	
Do you children read any books besides school books?	ITEM UNCHANGED	Do you children read any books besides school books? Index child:			
(IF YES)		(1) yes	30	CODE	28
		(2) no	2		2
		(3) can't rate	4	UNCHANGED	0
What kind of books do you read?		Siblings 8 to 12 (excluding index child):			
		(1) all yes	18	CODE	11
		(2) all no	2		3
		(3) some yes, some no	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) can't rate	8		7
		(5) not applicable	8		9
		Siblings over 12:			
		(1) all yes	14	CODE	13
		(2) all no	0		1
		(3) some yes, some no	0	UNCHANGED	0
		(4) can't rate	7		8
		(5) not applicable	15		8
		What kinds of books do you read? Index child:			
		(1) not applicable, e.g., index child does not read other books	5	CODE	2
		(2) reads comic books only	4	UNCHANGED	4
		(3) reads comic books and other books	9		10

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (36) (continued)		ITEM (36) (continued)	
		What kinds of books do you read (continued)? Index child (continued):			
		(4) reads other books only	15		12
		(5) can't rate	3		2
		Siblings 8 to 12 (excluding index child):			
		(1) not applicable, no other siblings or siblings do not read	15	CODE	11
		(2) most or all read comic books only	4		3
		(3) most or all read comic books and other books	1	UNCHANGED	4
		(4) most or all read other books only	13		3
		(5) can't rate	3		9
		(6) other	0		0
		Siblings over 12:			
		(1) not applicable, e.g., no siblings over 12 or siblings do not read	20	CODE DELETED,	
		(2) all siblings read age-appropriate material	9	FORM II	

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (36) (continued) What kinds of books do you read (continued)? Siblings over 12 (continued): (3) some read age-appropriate material, some do not 2 (4) few or none read age-appropriate material 2 (5) can't rate 3 (6) other 0	ITEM (36) (continued)
ITEM (36.5) ITEM NOT DEVELOPED, FORM I	ITEM (36.5) Ask children: Does anyone in the family ever help you with your homework? (IF YES) Who? About how often?	ITEM (36.5)	ITEM (36.5) Does anyone in your family ever help you with your homework? (0) no (all siblings are 10 and older) 2 (1) no (some siblings are under 10) 0 (2) mother only 11 (3) father only 2 (4) mother and father only 0 (5) older siblings only 3 (6) parent(s) and older siblings or other relatives 12 (7) no answer / can't rate 0 (8) not applicable 0 (9) other 0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (36.5) (continued)	ITEM (36.5) (continued) About how often? (0) not applicable 2 (1) daily 12 (2) 3 or more times per week 0 (3) once or twice a week 10 (4) every few weeks 1 (5) once a month 1 (6) less than once a month or rarely 2 (7) no answer 0 (8) can't rate 2 (9) other 0
ITEM (37) Ask entire family: Does anyone in the family ever read to the children? (IF YES) Who? About how often? (Probe for example, would you say daily, three or more times a week, once or twice a week, every few weeks, once a month?	ITEM (37) ITEM UNCHANGED	ITEM (37) Does anyone in the family ever read to the family? (0) no (all siblings are 10 and older) 4 (1) no (some siblings are under 10) 5 (2) mother only 11 (3) father only 0 (4) mother and father only 0 (5) older siblings only 8 (6) parent(s) and older siblings or other relatives 8 (7) no answer } can't rate } 0 (8) not applicable 0 (9) other 0	ITEM (37) CODE 7 UNCHANGED 5 9 2 0 6 1 0 0 0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (37) (continued)		ITEM (37) (continued)		ITEM (37) (continued)	
		About how often?			
		(0) not applicable	9	CODE	12
		(1) daily	4		2
		(2) 3 or more times per week	7	UNCHANGED	2
		(3) once or twice a week	10		10
		(4) every few weeks	4		2
		(5) once a month	1		1
		(6) less than once a month or rarely	1		1
		(7) no answer	0		0
		(8) can't rate	0		0
		(9) other	0		0
Does anyone ever listen to the children read?		Does anyone ever listen to the children read?			
(IF YES)		(0) no (all siblings are 10 and older)	2	CODE	1
Who?		(1) no (some siblings are under 10)	1	UNCHANGED	1
About how often?		(2) mother only	16		19
		(3) father only	0		0
		(4) mother and father only	2		1
		(5) older siblings only	4		5
		(6) parent(s) and older siblings or other relatives	11		2
		(7) no answer can't rate	0		0
		(8) not applicable	0		0
		(9) other	0		1

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS---FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (37) (continued)		ITEM (37) (continued)		ITEM (37) (continued)	
		About how often?			
		(0) not applicable	3	CODE	2
		(1) daily	15		7
		(2) 3 or more times per week	4	UNCHANGED	2
		(3) once or twice a week	9		16
		(4) every few weeks	3		2
		(5) once a month	1		0
		(6) less than once a month or rarely	1		0
		(7) no answer	0		0
		(8) can't rate	0		1
		(9) other	0		0
Does anyone in the family ever tell stories to the children?		Does anyone in the family ever tell stories to the children?			
(IF YES)		(0) no (all children are 10 and older)	6	PARTS (0) - (9)	8
Who?		(1) no (some siblings are under 10)	14	UNCHANGED	11
About how often?		(2) mother only	5		3
		(3) father only	0	NOTE: ADDITION	1
		(4) mother and father only	0	OF CODE (X)	0
		(5) older siblings only	6		2
		(6) index child only	2		0
		(7) parents and older siblings	2		2
		(8) no answer can't rate not applicable	0		0
		(9) other	1		1
				(X) mixed; combination of two or more of above	2

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (37) (continued)	ITEM (37) (continued)
		About how often?	
		(0) not applicable 20	CODE 19
		(1) daily 4	2
		(2) 3 or more times per week 0	UNCHANGED 2
		(3) once or twice a week 4	1
		(4) every few weeks 2	2
		(5) once a month 3	0
		(6) less than once a month or rarely 1	1
		(7) no answer 0	0
		(8) can't rate 2	3
ITEM (37.5)	ITEM (37.5) Ask parent(s):	ITEM (37.5)	ITEM (37.5)
ITEM NOT DEVELOPED,	What do you think is the most important thing your children should learn in school?		What do you think is the most important thing your children should learn in school?
FORM I			(1) reading (check here when "reading" is the only response) 11
	Why?		(2) reading and either other school work or behavior 10
			(3) academic content only 1
			(4) appropriate behavior only 5
			(5) mixed, e.g., academic content other than reading and behavior 1
			(6) can't rate 2
			(7) other 0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING-----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (38) Ask parent(s):	ITEM (38)	ITEM (38)		ITEM (38)	
Do you ever get a chance to read any newspapers, magazines, or books?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	Does mother ever get a chance to read any newspapers, magazines, or books?			
		(1) yes	29	CODE	28
		(2) no	2		0
(IF YES)		(3) sometimes	5	UNCHANGED	1
		(4) no answer	0		0
		(5) can't rate	0		1
		(6) not applicable	0		0
		(7) other	0		0
Could you give me some examples of any newspapers, magazines, or books that you have read lately?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	What does she read?			
		(1) not applicable, response other than "yes" or "sometimes" to part (a)	2	PARTS (1) - (6)	1
Do you have any books or magazines in the house right now?	ITEM PART DELETED, FORM II	(2) books stressed (even if other mentioned)	2	AND (8) and (9)	1
		(3) daily newspaper only	4		4
		(4) magazines only	1	UNCHANGED	0
		(5) daily newspaper(s) and magazines	17	NOTE: MODIFICATION	19
		(6) daily newspaper(s), magazines, and books	3	OF PART (7)	4
		(7) daily newspaper(s) and books	3	(7) daily newspaper(s) and books; or magazines and books	1
		(8) can't rate	1		0
		(9) other	3		0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
ITEM (38.5) ITEM NOT DEVELOPED, FORM II	ITEM (38.5) Ask parent(s): (Note question is not applicable if index is only child or if siblings are infants.) Would you say that your children are very much alike or very different from one another? (IF ALIKE) In what ways are your children alike? (IF DIFFERENT) In what ways are your children different?	ITEM (38.5)	ITEM (38.5) Would you say that your children are very much alike or very different from one another? (1) mother says children are alike 11 (2) mother says children are different 15 (3) can't rate 3 (4) not applicable, e.g., index is only child 1 (5) other 0 How are children very much alike or very different from one another? (Non-content code based upon mother's conceptual skill in answering the question.) (1) mother displays conceptual skills, i.e., is able to describe similarities or differences among children 14 (2) mother does not display conceptual skills, i.e., gives vague or irrelevant response 14 (3) can't rate 1 (4) not applicable; e.g., index is only child 1 (5) other 0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
ITEM (39) Ask children:	ITEM (39)	ITEM (39)	ITEM (39)
Can you remember anything you've done you thought your mother (parents) was (were) proud of?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	Can you remember anything you've done you thought your mother was proud of? Index child:	
(IF YES) What did you do?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	(1) not applicable; e.g., no response from index child 6	PARTS (1) to (7) UNCHANGED 3
		(2) no 3	4
How did you know that she (they) was (were) proud of you?	What does your mother do to let you know she's proud of you?	(3) yes: school or academic achievement mentioned; e.g., homework, grades, teacher praise, good test marks, etc. (Check here even if mentioned in combination with other categories.) 17	NOTE: ADDITION OF PART (8) 14
(IF NO) Can you think of anything that would make your mother (parents) proud of you?	ITEM PART DELETED, FORM II	(4) yes: nonschool achievement noted; e.g., special activity at church, achievement in community club, receiving athletic trophy, etc. 3	3
		(5) yes: helping mother; e.g., washing floors, helping with chores, etc. 4	4
		(6) can't rate 1	0
		(7) other 2	0
			(8) other non-achievement mentioned; e.g., being in a wedding, getting to school on time 2

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (39) (continued)		ITEM (39) (continued)	
		Can you remember anything you've done you thought your mother was proud of? (continued) Children other than index child five years of age or older:			
		(1) not applicable; e.g., no siblings or no siblings five years or older	3	PARTS (1) to (7)	1
		(2) all or almost all say "no"	1	UNCHANGED	0
		(3) all or almost all say "yes": school or academic achievement mentioned; e.g., homework, grades, teacher praise, good test marks, etc. (Check here even if mentioned in combination with other categories)	18	NOTE: ADDITION OF PART (8)	19
		(4) all or almost all say "yes": nonschool achievement noted;e.g., special activity at church, achievement in community club, receiving athletic trophy, etc.	2		1
		(5) all or almost all say "yes": helping mother; e.g., washing floors, helping with chores, etc.	2		1

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (39) (continued)	ITEM (39) (continued)
		Can you remember anything you've done you thought your mother was proud of? (continued) Children other than index child five years of age or older (continued):	
		(6) can't rate and/or mixed 7	7
		(7) other 3	0
			(8) other non-achievement mentioned; e.g., "getting married" 1
		If "yes" above to (a) and/or (b): How did you know that she was proud of you?	If "yes" above to (a) and/or (b): How do you usually know that she is proud of you?
		(1) not applicable; e.g., no "yes" responses to (a) or (b) 1	CODE UNCHANGED 2
		(2) physical, facial expressive aspects of mother's response noted; e.g., "smiles at us," "by the look on her face," "she seems happy," "she laughs," "her eyes light up," "cries," etc. 4	NOTE: MODIFICATION OF QUESTION 5
		(3) physical display of emotion; e.g., hugs 0	4
		(4) verbal response of mother is noted; e.g., "talks a lot about it," "tells us," "asks questions" 12	5

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (39) (continued)	ITEM (39) (continued)
		If "yes" above to (a) and/or (b): How did you know that she was proud of you? (cont.)	If "yes" above to (a) and/or (b): How do you usually know that she is proud of you? (cont.)
		(5) mother uses concrete rewards; e.g., "buys us things," etc. 0	1
		(6) mother attends special school or nonschool events 2	0
		(7) mixed; combination of two or more of above 15	10
		(8) can't rate 2	3
		(9) other 0	0
ITEM (40) Ask parent(s):	ITEM (40)	ITEM (40)	ITEM (40)
When your children have done something that you approve of, what do you do?	ITEM UNCHANGED	When your children have done something that you approve of, what do you do? (Code for mother only.)	
Tell me your feelings when your children make you proud of them.		(1) children are given concrete rewards only, e.g., money, takes them out, etc. 7	PARTS (1) to (9) UNCHANGED 3
		(2) mother gives verbal reenforcement, encouragement, or praise only (may or may not include praising children to others) 13	16
What do you think your children's feelings are when you're proud of them?		(3) mother gives physical affection only; e.g., hugs, kisses 3	3

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (40) (continued)	ITEM (40) (continued)
		When your children have done something that you approve of, what do you do? (Code for mother only.) (continued)	
		(4) mixed; combination of (1) and (2) 6	NOTE: ADDITION 3
		(5) mixed; combination of (1) and (3) 3	OF PART (0) 1
		(6) mixed; combination of (2) and (3) 1	2
		(7) mixed; combination of (1), (2), and (3) 3	0
		(8) can't rate 0	1
		(9) other 0	0
			(0) mother says she does nothing 1
ITEM (41) Ask children:	ITEM (41)	ITEM (41)	ITEM (41)
Have you children ever done anything that you thought your mother (parents) was (were) angry about?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	Have you children ever done anything that you thought your mother (parents) was (were) angry about? If YES, what did you do? (Code for index child only.)	
(IF YES)		(0) no 2	CODE 0
What did you do?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	(1) yes: school related behavior noted; e.g., poor grades, failure to do homework, etc. 0	UNCHANGED 0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
ITEM (41) (continued)	ITEM (41) (continued)	ITEM (41) (continued)	ITEM (41) (continued)
How did you know your mother (parents) was (were) angry?	How do you usually know that your mother is angry?	Have you children ever done anything that you thought your mother (parents) was (were) angry about? If YES, what did you do? (Code for index child only.) (cont.)	
How did you feel about this?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED		
(IF NO) What kinds of things might you do that would make your mother (parents) angry?	ITEM PART DELETED; FORM II	(2) yes: aggressive interpersonal activities, in or out of family noted; e.g., getting into fights, arguing with or picking on sibling 2	4
		(3) yes: distinctive activity noted; e.g., breaking a radio, breaking a dish, dropping things on the floor, etc. 4	7
		(4) yes: failure to abide by mother's "rules;" e.g., "came home late," "not telling mother where I am going," "not keeping promises," etc. 8	11
		(5) yes: vaguely stated misbehavior; e.g., "when we fuss" 3	3
		(6) yes: more specific misbehavior; e.g., "throwing bricks from an abandoned building" 3	1

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (41) (continued)	ITEM (41) (continued)
		Have you children ever done anything that you thought your mother (parents) was (were) angry about? If YES, what did you do? (Code for index child only.) (cont.)	
		(7) yes: encroachment on parent(s) possessions; e.g., "when we wear her things" 1	0
		(8) mixed; combination of above 3	1
		(9) response not elicited from index child 8	3
		(X) can't rate 0	0
		(Y) other 2	0
		How did you know when your mother (parents) was (were) angry? (Code for all children.)	How do you usually know when your mother (parents) is (are) angry? (Code for all children.)
		(1) responses of "no" were elicited from children to original question 2	CODE 0
		(2) she screams, yells, threatens, hollers, etc. 3	UNCHANGED 8
		(3) beats us, hits us (Check here if at least one instance of physical punishment is noted.) 6	4

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (41) (continued)	ITEM (41) (continued)
		How did you know when your mother (parents) was (were) angry? (Code for all children.) (continued)	How do you usually know when your mother (parents) is (are) angry? (Code for all children.) (continued)
		(4) tells us, talks to us, etc. (Check here if at least one instance of verbal responses is noted) 4	NOTE: MODIFICATION 7
		(5) nonphysical punishment; e.g., denial of privileges 0	OF QUESTION 0
		(6) expressive features of mother noted; e.g., looks a certain way, gets a mean face 3	2
		(7) mixed; combination of above 11	4
		(8) can't rate 4	5
		(9) other 3	0
		How did you feel about it? (For all siblings including index child.)	
		(1) not applicable; e.g., a response not obtained or response were "no" to original question 4	CODE 2
		(2) at least one (or more) of responses indicates anger 5	UNCHANGED 2

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
		ITEM (41) (continued)	ITEM (41) (continued)
		How did you feel about it? (For all siblings including index child.) (continued)	
		(3) at least one (or more) of responses indicates a sense of shame, of having done "wrong," etc. 5	3
		(4) at least one (or more) of responses indicates fear, feeling "scared" 3	1
		(5) at least one (or more) of responses indicates desire to get away from mother when she is angry 2	2
		(6) "terrible," "bad," "sad," if this is only response 9	15
		(7) mixed; combination of above 3	1
		(8) can't rate 4	4
		(9) other 1	0

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (42) Ask children:	ITEM (42)	ITEM (42)		ITEM (42)	
What kind of punishment does (do) your mother (parents) usually use?	ITEM UNCHANGED	What kind of punishment does your mother usually use?			
How do you feel when your mother (parents) punishe(s) you?		(1) physical punishment; e.g., hitting, spanking, etc. for younger children; denial of privileges, deprivation for older children; age-related punishment is specified	7	PARTS (1) to (6)	2
How do you think your mother (parents) feel(s) when she (they) has (have) to punish you?		(2) combination of above; however, no indication punishment is age-related	16	UNCHANGED	6
		(3) denial of privileges and/or deprivation only, e.g., staying in house, not watching T. V.	10	NOTE: ADDITION	15
		(4) physical punishment only	2	OF PART (7)	3
		(5) can't rate	0		0
		(6) other	1		1
				(7) none; children say mother does not punish them	3

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
ITEM (43) Ask parent(s):	ITEM (43)	ITEM (43)		ITEM (43)	
Do you tell your children why they are being punished?	ITEM PART DELETED, FORM II				
What are your feelings when you have to punish your children?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	What are your feelings when you have to punish your children?			
How do you think your children feel when you have to punish them?	ITEM PART UNCHANGED	(1) undifferentiated expression of sorrow, sadness, or anger unaccompanied by statements in re: discipline, necessity for punishment, etc. e.g., "It hurts me more than it hurts them."	17	PARTS (1) to (6) UNCHANGED	14
		(2) above, e.g., sorrow, sadness, but accompanied by implication that mother is thinking about discipline, the principle involved, the nature of the punishment	9	NOTE: ADDITION OF PART (7)	7
		(3) some expression, vague or otherwise that punishment is justified, or that mother is right, etc.	4		4

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		ITEM (43) (continued) What are your feelings when you have to punish your children? (continued)		ITEM (43) (continued)	
		(4) some expression of sorrow, sadness, etc. but for mother-oriented reason, e.g., mother finds keeping children in house an inconvenience	2		0
		(5) can't rate	3		2
		(6) other	1		0
				(7) not applicable; e.g., mother does not punish children	3
ITEMS (44) through (48) NOTE: These items were included to provide additional behavioral data for family ratings. They were not coded on either interview form.					
ITEM (44) Ask entire family: What happens if someone in the family is upset or unhappy? Let's suppose, for example, that (name index child) went out with money to buy groceries but came home angry because someone had stolen his (her) money. Tell me what (name index child) and the other family members would do.	ITEM UNCHANGED				

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
ITEM (45) Ask entire family: Who decides what programs to watch on T.V.? Let's suppose that tonight two of you want to watch a program on Channel 2 but the rest of the family wants to watch Channel 7. What would do? (If family indicates there would be some argument over which program to watch, ask: Do you usually settle arguments this way or do you settle some arguments differently?)	ITEM UNCHANGED		
ITEM (46) Ask entire family: What is the last thing the whole family did together? For example, a trip you took, a movie you went to, or if you all went out somewhere together. When was this?	ITEM UNCHANGED		

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I	CODING----FORM II
ITEM (46) (continued) How did you decide where you were going to go and what you were going to do? Tell me a little about what you did when you went there.			
ITEM (47) Ask entire family: What are some of the worst things that have happened in this family? For example, have you ever been in a fire, has your apartment ever been burglarized, has something ever happened to a family member that upset you?	ITEM UNCHANGED		
ITEM (48) Ask entire family: If this family could change in any way, what are some of the ways you would like to see yourselves change?	ITEM UNCHANGED		

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
Household Ratings: These ratings were not part of the formal interview. They were made by each of the two interviewers, independently, following the family interview.					
		Type of building in which household is located:			
		(1) rooming house	0	CODE	0
		(2) public housing	6		1
		(3) apartment house with five or more units (not public housing)	29	UNCHANGED	29
		(4) two to four family house	0		0
		(5) can't rate	1		0
		(1) renovated or new building	7	CODE	2
		(2) old building, unrenovated	28	UNCHANGED	28
		(3) can't rate	1		0
		(4) other	0		0
		Condition of building:			
		(1) excellent; e.g., in good repair, clean stairways and halls, elevator in operating order, no garbage accumulation	4	CODE	1
		(2) good; e.g., in generally good repair, generally clean appearance of stairways and halls	7	UNCHANGED	4

INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM I	INTERVIEW ITEMS----FORM II	CODING----FORM I		CODING----FORM II	
		Condition of building: (continued)			
		(3) poor; e.g., needs painting, garbage and/or odors in halls, generally unclean appearance	18		23
		(4) can't rate	7		2
		Condition of house interior:			
		(1) excellent; e.g., neat and clean appearance, orderliness, furniture and appliances in good condition	5	CODE	3
		(2) good; e.g., generally neat and/or clean, but may be some disorder	19	UNCHANGED	21
		(3) poor; e.g., disorderly, clothing and objects left to accumulate around the room. evidence of unswept dirt, grime, etc.	3		6
		(4) can't rate	9		0